The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOLUME XLVII APRIL 1961 NUMBER 2

BERTOLT BRECHT'S "PROSPECTUS OF THE DIDEROT SOCIETY"

Mordecai Gorelik

BERTOLT BRECHT, the German poet-dramatist (1898-1956), is now somewhat of a legend. His plays are collected and produced, and anyone in the educational theatre would know about him. Anything he wrote now has some interest to students of the theatre. It is with the thought that a statement he made on a world theatre, in which I had some part, would contribute to our knowledge of Brecht that I am here presenting his "Prospectus of the Diderot Society."

The statement was drawn up by Brecht in the Fall of 1936, translated by myself, and signed by us both. The original has no heading and no date. Brecht was then living in Svendborg, Denmark, an exile from his native Germany; I am told that he was at one time fifth on the Nazi extermination list.

Brecht liked to collaborate. In a sense his statement here given is his offer to collaborate with the world. That art is "opposed" to science is a notion which did not exist for Brecht, who saw art and science as inseparable, complementary ways of looking at life. He believed, further, that in this scientific age, art has much to learn from the inventiveness, methodology, and impersonal discipline of science. Therefore, he proposed the founding of a society which would approach the problems of theatre in a scientific spirit. This group would be named for Denis Diderot, playwright and philosopher of the French Revolution. Invitations to join the society would be forwarded to leading stage people of the world who were of a pioneer turn of mind.

The prospectus in English was sent out as a press release sometime in 1937, but failed to receive any attention as far as I know. A short excerpt from it was included in my book, *New Theatres for Old*; I do not believe it has ever before been printed in full. The German text, to my knowledge, has never been printed in any form. Its wording is somewhat difficult. Brecht, who wrote living dialogue for the stage, tended to use Latin structure and conceptual phrasing when he turned to theoretical work. The English translation is really an adaptation rather than a literal rendering. For this reason, the German text is given for

Mr. Gorelik is Research Professor in Theatre, Southern Illinois University. He is a professional stage and film designer and a play director. He is the author of New Theatres for Old.

those who wish to have the literal statement available.

PROSPECTUS OF THE DIDEROT SOCIETY

International societies of correspondence devoted to the interchange of scientific experience have existed for hundreds of years. The arts (we are concerned here with the theatrical arts, including the cinema) have not known corresponding societies of this sort. This fact may be explained by the traditional contrast between the methods of science and of art. The sciences have their technical standard, their common vocabulary, their continuity. For the arts (as we have known them hitherto), with their thoroughly individualistic character, such features have not been considered necessary.

As long as the theatre was regarded simply as a medium dedicated to the self-expression of the artistic personality, it was hardly possible to speak of a technical standard of theatrical art, except with regard to innovations in the mechanics of stage lighting, scene shifting, etc. For one artist to borrow from another a *means of expression* is to admit failure—to parade in borrowed plumage. (Be it noted, however, that this taboo does not apply to the soulless machinery of the stage!)

On the other hand the tasks assumed by science have never been limited to the capacity of individuals. The criterion of science has been, not the degree of individual talent, but the degree of general advance in the mastery of nature.

Like the theatre, science works by constructing images of life, in a fashion peculiar to itself. Scientific images seek to control the factual world. This is not so with the images created by the theatre. Theatrical images, shaped to a greater or lesser degree by the creative will of individuals, have sought rather to construct an independent world of emotion—to organize subjective sensations. For this purpose neither accuracy nor responsibility is required.

In recent decades, however, a new kind of theatre has developed—one which sets itself the goal of an exact picture of the world and which admits of objective, non-individualistic criteria. The artist who belongs to this theatre no longer attempts to create *his own world*. He does not set out to add to a stock of images which are essentially portraits of the portrayer. He does not assume that the laws of life are already codified and immutable. On the contrary, he regards the world as unknown and in constant process of change. His purpose is to create images informative of the world rather than of himself.

It is not easy to create images which will aid in mastering objective fact. This attempt naturally encounters great difficulties, and obliges the artist to refashion his technique to suit his new purpose.

The visionary ignores discoveries made by others; experiment is not among the mental habits of the seer. The *inner eye* has never needed microscope or telescope. But the outer eye needs both. Unlike the visionary or the seer, the artist in pursuit of a new goal finds no subliminal apparatus ready to serve him. He must renounce the technique of hypnotic enchantment. Under certain circumstances he must even forego the usual method of emotional communication used by the artists of earlier periods. The building and projection of this new type of image is a technical process beyond the limited capacity of individuals. The new artist therefore helps to develop a

technique which will be at the service of all artists. To this end he offers inventions of his own and makes use of the inventions of others. (Thus, in spite of the great differences between them, the stage and the cinema can operate together, insofar as both dramatic mediums explain nature and human relationships.)

THE DIDEROT SOCIETY intends to help gather systematically the experience of its members; to create a terminology; to review, scientifically, the historic conceptions of theatre. It will collect the reports of artists engaged in experimental work in theatre and film, and arrange for an interchange of these reports. (Papers sent to the Society may be published simultaneously elsewhere, with the subtitle: *Report to the Diderot Society*.) Members receiving reports from other members abroad will endeavor to place these writings in periodicals in their own language. It is proposed that an editorial board reissue all papers, numbered, in book form. The scope of any paper is left to the discretion of its author. Papers may be comprehensive essays or brief notes. They may describe an entire theatrical production; a mechanical discovery or invention of great or minor importance; experiences with audiences or with stage artists. Unsolved problems may be submitted. Technical details are especially interesting. Scenic innovations such as the treadmill stage (Piscator); analyses of new rhythmic forms; problems in the projection of stage or screen characters; the social meaning of certain texts; the dramatic development of a theme; utilization of facts; planning of preliminary work; study of source-material, of documents or of scientific methods; suggestions for a technical terminology; critiques of criticism, etc., etc.—all these may be the subject of reports to the Society.

There being no dues or other requirements, the Society will be considered organized when a sufficient number of qualified experimental workers indicate their willingness to contribute papers at their convenience, along the lines indicated. For the present the address of THE DIDEROT SOCIETY will be: care Brecht, Svendborg, Denmark. [The American news release carried this notice: American inquiries may be addressed to Mordecai Gorelik, 214 East 18th Street, New York City.] The Society will welcome information regarding periodicals or journals interested in publishing its reports.

Signed: BRECHT, SVENDBORG
GORELIK, NEW YORK

Seit Jahrhunderten existieren internationale Gesellschaften von Wissenschaftlern, welche den Austausch der Erfahrungen und Probleme organisieren. Die Wissenschaften haben ihren gemeinsamen Standard, ihr gemeinsames Vokabular, ihre Kontinuität. Das Faktum, dass die Künste (im Folgenden ist an die theatralischen Künste gedacht, zu denen auch die Filmkunst zu rechnen ist) keine solchen korrespondierenden Gesellschaften haben, erklärt sich aus der völlig individualistischen Struktur der Künste.

So lange das Theater als eine Stätte aufgefasst wurde, wo sich nur künstlerische Persönlichkeiten ausdrückten, war es kaum möglich, von einem technischen Standard der Theaterkunst anders als in Bezug auf einige mechanische Neuerungen, wie Beleuchtungstechnik und Verwandlungstechnik zu sprechen. Die Uebernahme von "Ausdrucksmitteln" eines Künstlers durch andere Künstler, soweit es sich nicht um "seelenlose" Maschinerie handelte, musste in gewissem Sinne verpönt er-

scheinen: es hätte bedeutet, "sich mit fremden Federn zu schmücken."

Ganz anders hatten die Wissenschaften überindividuelle Aufgaben und objective Kriterien. Sie konnten jederzeit von der Materie aus, die sie zu meistern sich bemühten, beurteilt werden.

Auch die Theater haben immer Darstellungen der Welt, d.h. des menschlichen Zusammenlebens, benutzt. Jedoch diente diese zur Schaustellung einer mehr oder weniger von individuellen Formungswillen geprägten Darstellung der Welt. Nicht gerade der Erkenntnis der realen Welt, vielmehr galt es, gewisse Emotionen zu erzeugen, "Erlebnisse" zu veranstalten. Die Darstellung der Welt brauchte zu diesem Zweck nicht genau oder verantwortlich zu sein.

Erst in den letzten Jahrzehnten entwickelte sich ein Theater, das grösseren Wert auf eine richtige Darstellung der Welt legte, wobei für diese Richtigkeit objektive, ausserindividuelle Kriterien zugelassen werden sollten. Der Künstler fühlte sich nicht mehr beauftragt, "seine eigene Welt" zu schaffen und, die wirkliche Welt als bekannt und unveränderlich auffassend, den Katalog der Abbildungen zu bereichern, welche eigentlich Abbildungen der Abbildner sind; vielmehr fühlte sich der Künstler nunmehr beauftragt, die Welt als veränderlich und unbekannt aufzufassen und solche Abbildungen abzuliefern, welche mehr über die Welt als über ihn Aufschluss geben. Die Herstellung von Abbildungen der Welt, welche dazu beitragen können, die Welt beherrschbar zu machen, stösst natürlich auf grosse Schwierigkeiten und zwingt die Künstler, für den geänderten Zweck, ihre Technik zu ändern. Hat das "innere Auge" keinerlei Mikroskop und keinerlei Fernrohr benötigt, so benötigt das äussere beide. Die Erfahrungen anderer Leute sind für den Visionär entbehrlich. Das Experiment gehört nicht zu den Gepflogenheiten des Sehers. Andererseits muss der Künstler, dem neuen Auftrag folgend, bei der Uebermittlung seiner Abbildungen verzichten auf die Mittel der Hypnose, unter Umständen sogar der gewöhnlichen Einfühlung, die dem Künstler früherer Epochen zur Verfügung standen. Dafür wird für den Künstler des neuen Auftrags die Uebermittlung wie die Herstellung seiner Abbildungen zu einer (ausserindividuellen) Technik; d.h. er beteiligt sich an dem Aufbau einer allen Künstlern zur Verfügung stehenden Technik, er bietet und benutzt neue Erfahrungen. Bei Aufrechterhaltung ihrer grossen Verschiedenheiten kann nunmehr auch eine Zusammenarbeit von Theater und Film erfolgen, da es sich und wie weit er sich bei beiden Kunstgattungen um Abbildung der Welt, Aufschlüsse über das Zusammenleben der Menschen handelt.

Die Diderot-Gesellschaft setzt sich die Aufgabe, Erfahrungen ihrer Mitglieder systematisch zu sammeln, eine Terminologie zu schaffen, die theatralischen Konzeptionen des Zusammenlebens der Menschen wissenschaftlich zu kontrollieren. Sie sammelt Berichte von mit Theater und Film experimentierenden Künstlern über ihre Arbeiten und organisiert deren Austausch. Die einzelnen Arbeiten, die der Gesellschaft eingereicht werden, können zugleich von ihren Verfassern in Zeitschriften veröffentlicht werden; sie sollen jedoch den Untertitel "Bericht an die Diderot-Gesellschaft" tragen. Die Mitglieder versuchen, die bei ihnen einlaufenden Arbeiten an Zeitschriften ihrer Sprache zu geben. Eine Redaktions-kommission kann die Arbeiten in Buchform, numeriert, herausgeben. Der Umfang der Arbeiten ist ins Belieben

der Verfasser gestellt; die Berichte können sehr kurz sein. Es kann sich um die Beschreibung einer ganzen Inszenierung oder um die Beschreibung technischer Neuerungen grösserer oder kleinerer Bedeutung handeln, ebenso um Erfahrungen mit dem Publikum oder mit reproduzierenden Künstlern. Probleme können auch ungelöst dargestellt werden. Gerade Fragen des Details sind von besonderem Interesse. Einführung und Verwendung solcher Neuerungen wie des laufenden Bandes (Piscator), Sinn neuer rhythmischer Formen, Probleme bei der Darstellung von Bühnen- oder Filmcharakteren, usw., usw., können Gegenstände von Berichten sein. Die soziale Bedeutung gewisser Stoffe und ihre Herausarbeitung, die Benutzung von Fakten, die Organisation von Vorarbeiten (Quellenstudium), von Dokumenten, von wissenschaftlichen Methoden, die Benutzung technischer Neuerungen, Vorschläge für *termini technici*, Kritik der Kritik, all das kann in Form von Berichten an die Gesellschaft behandelt werden.

Zur Begründung der Gesellschaft ist es nur nötig, dass einige, experimentelltätige Künstler ihre Bereitschaft erklären, Arbeiten der genannten Art nach Gelegenheit zu liefern. Erwünscht ist auch die Angabe solcher Zeitschriften, in denen solche Arbeiten vermutlich veröffentlicht werden können. Als vorläufige Adresse der DIDEROT-GESELLSCHAFT kann dienen: BRECHT, SVENDBORG, DANMARK.

Signed: BRECHT, SVENDBORG
GORELIK, NEW YORK

SEBASTIANO SERLIO: AN INQUIRY

Orville K. Larson

SEBASTIANO SERLIO, Italian painter, architect, and writer needs no introduction to those familiar with theatre history. He is important to our understanding of the theatre of the Italian Renaissance because of his interpretations and influential sketches of the stage settings of classical antiquity, his explanations of Renaissance stagecraft, and his instructions and diagrams for the erection of temporary theatres, such as were built in the great halls and courtyards of the Renaissance *palazzi*. Serlio included all of this information in a short section on theatre in his *Le seconde livre de perspective*, published first in Paris in 1545.[1] Because all of Serlio's explanations occur relative to the description of a theatre he built in Vicenza, it has been assumed by theatre historians that he was a practicing scene designer and they credit him with an extensive career in the theatre. It has been asserted, for example, that Serlio was very active "preparing spectacles for official celebrations,"[2] and that he "gained a great reputation as a successful artist of stage effects."[3]

Sebastiano Serlio was born in Bologna, Italy, on September 6, 1475, the son of a mediocre painter who gave him his early training as an artist. Little is known of his early life but records show that by 1500 he was working in Pesaro as a painter. Sometime after 1515 he went to Rome where he studied and worked with the painter and architect, Baldassarre Peruzzi. Peruzzi was one of the group of Renaissance architects who were very much interested in classical architecture, recording the ruins of antiquity and preparing commentaries on the classical architect, Vitruvius. Apparently, Serlio first became interested in classical architecture while helping Peruzzi measure the Roman ruins. Peruzzi also designed some scenery and is credited by Vasari with the introduction of perspective to the Renaissance stage. During the sack of Rome Serlio fled to Venice with his master but at the end of hostilities returned to the Eternal City to assist Peruzzi in building the Palazzo Massimo on the ruins of the classical theatre of Marcellus. After Peruzzi's death in 1537, Serlio went again to Venice and it was during this visit that he built his theatre in Vicenza. The same year he published, in Venice, Book IV of his *Regoli generali di Architettura*. The *Architettura* was planned as a monumental commentary and translation of Vitruvius' ten

This article has been adapted from a paper read at the fifth annual meeting of the American Society of Theatre Research, Columbia University, November 26, 1960. *Mr. Larson is Associate Professor of Fine Arts, Ohio University.*

[1] Published simultaneously in French and Italian. Another Italian edition appeared in Venice in 1551, and a pirated English translation was published in London in 1611. Recently, a new English translation by Allardyce Nicoll was published in *The Renaissance Stage*, ed. Barnard Hewitt (Coral Gables, 1958). All references to Serlio's work on theatre are from the Nicoll translation.

[2] *The Renaissance Stage*, p. 20.

[3] Lily B. Campbell, *Scenes and Machines on the English Stage During the Renaissance* (Cambridge, 1923), p. 42.

books on architecture. These volumes were not published consecutively; Book III was printed in 1540. The following year Serlio was summoned to the French court by Francis I to assist in the planning and building of Fontainbleau and the Louvre, and although he seems to have been well-liked by the French, there is little evidence to indicate that he made any important contributions to either. In 1545, Books I and II of *di Architettura* (the latter containing the aforementioned section on theatre) were published simultaneously in Paris. Two years later the fifth book appeared. After the death of Francis I in March of 1547, a growing nationalistic feeling in the French court found many foreign artists out of favor, and Serlio was dismissed. In ill health and financially destitute, he moved on to Lyons, France, where he was befriended by a former patron, the Italian Cardinal of Ferrara. While in Lyons he worked on several architectural commissions including the planning and building of the Lyons Loges au Change. He published there his *Livre extraordinaire de architecture* in 1551. Serlio returned to Fontainbleau in 1553 where he died the following year. A seventh book on architecture was published posthumously in Frankfort in 1575, and he left in manuscript a work on military architecture. Contemporary architectural historians agree that Serlio's importance is that of an architectural historian rather than a practicing Renaissance architect.[4]

As Allardyce Nicoll has pointed out recently, Serlio's account of his work in the theatre shows evidence of having been written in great haste.[5] Serlio says many times, perhaps as an excuse for his brevity, that he could have written more on several subjects but that if he had he would have been considered verbose. But what he explains, he explains with the confidence of an experienced technician; his suggestion that the artist make a model of the stage setting to work out the difficulties of perspective, for example, is an extremely practical one. However, most of Serlio's theatrical experience is implied—by himself.

If Serlio was as active in the theatre as he implies—or as some historians would have us believe—it is odd that Giorgio Vasari did not mention these activities in his *Celebrated Lives of Architects, Painters and Sculptors.*[6] Vasari describes the theatrical activities of many Renaissance artists that have since been verified. Certainly, Vasari knew of Serlio because he mentions him in his account of the life of Baldassarre Peruzzi.[7] Yet, he makes no mention of Serlio ever working in the theatre.

The apparent lack of contemporary references to Serlio's theatrical activities raises two questions: How much work did Serlio actually do in the theatre? And—in view of an apparently limited activity—how was he able to write about Renaissance stagecraft with

[4] For general biographical accounts of Serlio and his work see *Elogio de Sebastiano Serlio, architetto Bolognesi dedicato alla pontifica Accademia di belle arti in Bologna dal Marchese Antonio Bolognini Amorini* (Bologna, 1823), hereafter cited as Amorini; Leon Charvet, *Sebastian Serlio, 1475-1554* (Lyons, 1869), Adolfo Venturi, *Storia dell'Arte Italiana, IX, L'Architettura del Cinquecento*, I (Milano, 1938), 440-48; and specifically William Bell Dinsmore, "The Literary Remains of Sebastiano Serlio," *The Art Bulletin*, XXIV (1942), 55-91, 115-154. Theatre historians—probably because of its deceptive title—have consistently ignored Dinsmore's definitive biographical account of Serlio ever since it first appeared in 1942.

[5] *The Renaissance Stage*, p. 21.

[6] Giorgio Vasari, *Le vite de' piu eccellenti Architetti, pittori et sculptori italiani da Cimabue insimo a tempio nostri* (Florence, 1568). All references and quotations from G. Vasari, *The Lives of the Painters, Sculptors, and Architects*, trans. A. B. Hinds, Everyman ed., 4 vols. (London, 1927)—hereafter cited as *Lives*.

[7] *Lives*, II, 293-99.

such technical proficency? Let us examine first Serlio's own statements about his work in Vicenza. "In Vicenza, the richest and proudest among cities in Italy," he writes, "I built an auditorium and stage of wood, perhaps—nay, without a doubt—the largest erected in our times, where for the marvelous *intermezzi* there [were provided] . . . chariots, elephants, and various morris dances." This edifice, he says, "was set in a large courtyard." Although Serlio says he built a large wooden theatre in a courtyard, he fails to mention the date, occasion, the location in Vicenza, or the sponsor of the project. Evidence indicates that Serlio was called to Vicenza in 1539 to help plan the restoration of the Basilica. Although Andrea Palladio completed the restoration in 1554, records show that on February 20, 1539, Serlio was paid two *scudi d'oro* for a model he prepared for the restoration of the loggia of the Basilica.[8] It must have been during this time that he was commissioned to erect a temporary theatre, because Gian-Domenico, father of Vicenzo Scamozzi, says in a 1584 edition of *di Architettura* that Serlio arrived in time for the pre-Lenten carnival season and that he saw the marvelous *intermezzi* Serlio mentions, in the courtyard of the Porto Palace, now known as the Palace Colleoni.[9] Although Licisco Magagnato does not substantiate this fact in his definitive study on the genesis of the Teatro Olympico,[10] George Kernodle links the building of the theatre to the activities of the Accademia Olympica.[11]

If, however, the sponsors of the theatre are still undetermined, we at least know that Serlio built his theatre in the courtyard of the Porto Palace early in 1539 and the production that Serlio prepared there included elaborate *intermezzi.*

In addition to Serlio's account of his work in Vicenza, my investigation reveals only two instances of work of a theatrical nature: one in Pesaro in 1511, and the other in Lyons in 1552. Both references are vague and one is even doubtful.

Of the Pesaro activity, the evidence is only a statement of fact. The Marchese Antonio Bolognini Amorini found among the painters listed in the description of a procession that occurred in Pesaro in 1511 that Serlio was listed *with honors* (Amorini's italics).[12] In all probability, this procession was a continuation of the lengthy celebration of the wedding of the Duchess Eleonora Gonzaga to Duke Francesco Maria I della Rovere in Urbino in 1509. Serlio probably worked under Timoteo of Urbino who, Vasari says, "created triumphal arches resembling those of the ancients for the wedding of Duchess Leonora to Duke Francesco Maria."[13]

More information surrounds the Lyons reference. In the Lyons *Registre Consulaire* in 1552 there is recorded a payment to Serlio for services rendered on the occasion of the entry of the Cardinal of Tournon into Lyons that same year. Just what these services were is not stated, but this apparently is the reference that has given rise to the myth of Serlio's extensive work in the theatre. Certainly, this is the source of Allardyce Nicoll's exaggeration in *The Renaissance Stage,* when he asserts that "Again the Renaissance artist was pre-

[8] Venturi, p. 441.

[9] Cited from *Del Teatro Olympico de Andrea Palladio in Vicenza, Discorso del Conte Giovanni Montenari,* 2nd, ed. (Padova, 1748), pp. 5-6.

[10] Licisco Magagnato, "The Genesis of the Teatro Olympico," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtlaud Institute,* XIV (1951), 209 ff. See also Magagnato, *Teatro Italiani del Cinquecento* (Venezia, 1954), p. 40.

[11] George Kernodle, *From Art to Theatre* (Chicago, 1944), p. 169.

[12] Amorini, p. 3.

[13] *Lives,* II, 274.

paring spectacles for official celebrations."[14]

The facts surrounding the Cardinal's entry into Lyons in 1552 are these: Under the influence of Francis I, who had encouraged the importation of many foreign artists during his reign, Italian craftsmen had established in Lyons between 1535 and 1540 several centers for the manufacture of velour and crockery. After the monarch's death, in an attempt to carry on Louis XI's policies unifying France and furthering a nationalistic spirit, the new king, Henry II, issued his "rights of foreigners" decree which curtailed sharply the rights and activities of foreign merchants. By 1552 this decree had diminished considerably the operations of the Lyons fair where the Italians were the chief merchants. The Consulate, and especially the Italians, planned to ask the Cardinal of Tournon to intercede with the king on their behalf when the religious dignitary arrived. Thus preparations for his entry were made.

As previously mentioned, Serlio's relationship to the entry is vague. No elaborate description, such as was published for Henry II's entry in 1548, exists. The entry took place on Wednesday, September 28, and the references to the preparations, as recorded in the Lyons *Registre Consulaire* in 1552, are as follows:

August 4, 1552:

Item: At the portal of the Rhone bridge, a festoon shall be made, as good as can be made, on the orders of those who were commissioned by the Consulate.

Item: Another festoon similar to the first, and just as good as the first, shall be placed on the bridge of the Sâone river, according to the design and orders of those who were commissioned to make them.

Item: In order to erect the aforementioned festoons and triumphal arches on the bridges of the Rhone and the Sâone, and in order that all be erected that is necessary, Mssrs. Nicola du Pré, de Bourg, Gautier, and Le Gourt may hire all personnel and make all expenditures necessary.[15]

It is also recorded on September 27 that the Consulate directed that a platform be constructed "toward the Motte . . . which shall be covered with tapestries, upon which the Cardinal of Tournon shall stand and observe the passing procession and hear the harangues, etc." They directed that the "Counselors Francois Salla, Nicola du Pré, Claude Benoist, and Claude Platet [be] commissioned and deputized to carry . . . at the entry of the Right Reverend Signor, Cardinal of Tournon, Archbishop of this village, a canopy of blue damask, made especially for this occasion and decorated all over with the insignia of the Archbishop, embroidered with silk and gold. They will carry the aforementioned canopy from the gateway of the Rhone bridge to the Portefroc."[16]

Leon Charvet, one of Serlio's biographers, suggested in 1869 that Serlio was engaged to design triumphal arches for the entry because the Italians in Lyons would have employed the most illustrious artist available to help them impress the Cardinal. To support this contention, Charvet calls attention to the fact that Serlio is addressed as "Master" in the *Registre*, a Renaissance term of great respect.[17] Theatre historians apparently have accepted Charvet's assumption without question ever since. However, the *Registre* of November 24, 1552, tells us only that "a payment was made to Master Sebastian Bolognesi Italian engineer of the sum of twelve *ecus d'or*, which was given and presented to him for the services he performed for the entry of Mon-

[14] *The Renaissance Stage*, p. 20.

[15] Cited from Charvet, p. 90.

[16] *Ibid.*

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 91.

seigneur, the Most Reverend Cardinal of Tournon, Archbishop of this village, on his first and joyous vistation to our city."[18] The *Registre* does not say what services Serlio performed, and in this specific instance, Serlio is not even referred to as an artist or architect but as an *engineer*: "Master Sebastian Bolognesi Italian engineer." This suggests that Serlio was not employed to create triumphal arches, as Charvet contends, or any kind of elaborate theatrical decorations, as Nicoll contends, but that his services were practical rather than artistic.

A knowledge of scene design which included the principles of perspective, was part and parcel of the training of Renaissance architects because they were constantly called upon to supply theatrical decorations for all kinds of performances, festivals, and processions. In the absence of any references to extensive theatrical activities prior to 1539, the question then arises, where did Serlio get the practical training in stagecraft that is reflected in his explanations of technical processes. It would be preposterous to assume that Serlio put into practice in Vicenza all the stage effects he describes in 1545. How then was he able to explain so many technical details with such clarity? Where did he get his information?

The general assumption is that he was describing the practices of the times which he personally had observed, an assumption obviously based upon Serlio's own statement: "Sometime ago my eyes beheld such scenes." Another common assumption is that he acquired his information while working with Baldassarre Peruzzi in Rome. Possibly. Vasari, in his *Lives*, describes Peruzzi as a practicing scene designer and describes his setting for a production in Rome in 1514 in glowing terms.[19] This however, was prior to Serlio's arrival in Rome. There is no evidence to indicate that Serlio ever worked on a production with Peruzzi, or that Peruzzi worked on any other productions after the 1514 production that Vasari describes.[20]

There are indications, however, to support the idea that Serlio's knowledge of technical theatre was not acquired only through observation or hearsay but gained firsthand. Serlio says in his description of the classical settings of antiquity that he saw a satyric setting created by the architect Giroloma Genga, "at the instance of his Lord, Francesco Maria, Duke of Urbino." Giroloma Genga, like Timoteo, was an architect and painter to the Urbino court while Serlio was still in Pesaro. Of Genga, Vasari says, "The Duke employed [him] . . . especially to make apparatus and scenery for the comedies, in which he succeeded admirably owing to his knowledge of perspective and his principles of architecture."[21] Although substantiating evidence is lacking, it may be suggested that Serlio actually worked with Genga and Timoteo on productions in the Urbino court, and particularly on the Urbino production of Cardinal Bibbiena's *La Calandria* in 1513. Pesaro is less than twenty miles from Urbino, and there is ample evidence to prove that Serlio was in the vicinity in 1513. His name appears, for example, as a witness to the last

[18] *Ibid.*

[19] *Lives*, II, 297.

[20] Richard Krautheimer pointed out over a decade ago that in addition to Vasari's remarks, the only evidence that we have on Peruzzi's work in the theatre are two sketches: one a design for a series of angle wings for the left side of a street scene, in the Biblioteca del Palazzo Reale in Turin, and the other a full sheet drawing for a street scene, in the Uffizi Gallery in Florence, and both of these lack attribution. See Krautheimer, "The Tragic and Comic Scenes of the Renaissance," *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, 6th Series, XXXIII (1948), 338.

[21] *Lives*, III, 262.

will and testament of one Beatrix de Manfredi de Reggio, made in Pesaro on September 17, 1514.[22] Other evidence cites Serlio as working as a painter in the convent of the Servites in Pesaro from 1511 to 1515.[23] The Marchese Amorini has already made us aware, albeit by implication, of Serlio's reputation in Pesaro as a painter and theatrical decorator. It does not seem unlikely, therefore, that he was summoned to Urbino in 1513 to assist Genga and Timoteo prepare scenery for the *La Calandria* production.

Serlio's remarks concerning the nymphs, sirens, satyrs, and monsters in his comments on the *intermezzi* of the Vicenza production in 1539 are reminiscent of similar remarks about similar characters in Count Baldassarre Castiglione's description of the 1513 production of *La Calandria,* especially in the account of the third *intermezzo.* Serlio's descriptions of the street scenes with their elaborate buildings illuminated with "jewel-like" stage lights echo Castiglione's remarks about the street scene in *La Calandria,* particularly his description of the temple which stood in the middle of the stage.[24] The theatrical productions of the court of Urbino during the early reign of Duke Francesco I may very well have been the laboratory in which Serlio learned the principles and practice of Renaissance stagecraft.

One additional observation is apropos. In 1514, *La Calandria* was performed in Rome as a part of the entertainment Pope Leo X provided on the occasion of the visit of Isabella Gonzaga d'Este. Duke Francesco I of Urbino was in charge of this production.[25] It is not unreasonable to assume that Duke Francesco did everything possible to repeat his successful Urbino production. Peruzzi created the setting which, according to Vasari, was outstanding for its perspective scene. It is quite possible, however, that the Roman production followed very closely not only Genga's original setting but his technical practices, too. The Duke would have seen to that. This suggests that when Vasari praises Peruzzi for "arranging the lights inside [the buildings] for the perspectives,"[26] he was actually referring to the method Serlio describes in his section "on artificial lights for scenes": the arrangement of the *bozze* or glass vials filled with wine or colored water placed in front of the lamps. Perhaps both Peruzzi and Serlio learned this method from a common source: the Urbino production of *La Calandria.*

Although conclusive evidence to support the lengthy allusion to Serlio's activities in the Urbino court theatre is nonexistent, it is still within the realm of possibility, and as such it is advanced as one possible explanation of the source of Serlio's knowledge of technical theatre practices. It remains, however, pure conjecture. Whether Sebastiano Serlio was an extensive practitioner of the theatrical arts or not, his importance in theatre history cannot be denied. His short treatise remains one of the very best primary sources on the theatre of the Italian Renaissance. Our investigation reveals, however, that he was less of a theatrical specialist than some theatre historians have imagined. What emerges is a typical artist of the Renaissance for whom theatre was but one area of the entire field of creative endeavor.

[22] Amorini, p. 3. See also Venturi, p. 440.

[23] *Enciclopedia economia, per cura de Francesco Predani* (Torino, 1861), II, 1078.

[24] Julia Cartwright Ady, *The Perfect Courtier, Baldassarre Castiglione* (London, 1908), I, 336-340; reprinted in *The Portable Renaissance Reader* (New York, 1958), pp. 460-465.

[25] Alois Nagler, *Sources of Theatrical History* (New York, 1952), p. 72.

[26] *Lives,* II, 297.

JOHN F. KENNEDY IN THE TRADITION OF INAUGURAL SPEECHES

Donald L. Wolfarth

ON March 4, 1817, President Monroe delivered his inaugural address as part of the first outdoor inauguration of an American president. On January 20, 1961, the thirty-fifth president, John F. Kennedy, faced east from the Capitol toward the grounds that have known inaugural crowds since the days of Monroe and presented our most recent presidential inaugural address. One news magazine later observed that the new president "followed the tradition of all Presidents at such ceremonies."[1]

Although the inaugural address is custom, it has no legal basis. The first section of Article II of the United States Constitution provides, merely, that "Before he [the president-elect] enter on the Execution of his Office, he shall take the following Oath or Affirmation:—'I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my Ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.'" Observing the Constitutional provisions, Henry S. Commager concludes that the inaugural address itself is but "a product of custom and tradition."[2]

Mr. Wolfarth is Assistant Professor of Speech at Midland College. *Portions of this article are based on research conducted for his doctoral dissertation, "The Inaugural Addresses of the Presidents of the United States: A Content Analysis" (University of Minnesota, 1959).*

[1] *United States News and World Report,* L (January 30, 1961), 35.

[2] Henry S. Commager, "To Preserve Protect and Defend," *Senior Scholastic,* LIII (January 19, 1949), 11.

Just what are the customs and traditions which surround this first major address of each new president? It is the purpose of this paper to outline the principal lines of rhetorical tradition found in the inaugural addresses of American presidents and to inspect the address of John F. Kennedy in the light of this tradition.[3]

What is the traditional length of an inaugural address? There are 1300 words in Washington's first inaugural and no successor has gauged his first inaugural more closely to that of Washington than did Kennedy with 1355 words. Only five presidents have had shorter first inaugurals than Washington. The longest address was the 8578-word speech of William Henry Harrison which has been variously reported as lasting "an hour"[4] and extending "an hour and forty minutes."[5]

The average length of a first inaugural address is 2848 words. Seventeen of the thirty-one first inaugurals have been shorter than this. The twentieth century has heard both the shortest

[3] Textual authenticity must always be a concern of speech analysis. In this interest, line by line collation was made of collections of inaugural addresses, of addresses found in published works by various presidents, the *Congressional Record,* Richardson's *Messages And Papers of the Presidents,* newspaper accounts, phonograph and tape recordings. The best single source was the 1952 *Inaugural Addresses of the Presidents of the United States* (House Document 540, the 82nd Congress). Used for this research was the GPO edition plus tape recordings of the more recent inaugural addresses, including Kennedy's.

[4] Joseph B. Bishop, *Presidential Nominations and Elections* (New York, 1916), p. 210.

[5] "Custom," *New Yorker,* January 22, 1949, p. 17.

first inaugural (T. Roosevelt's 983 words) and the second longest (Taft's 5425 words). Franklin Roosevelt broke the chain of longer first inaugurals running from Harding through Hoover, and all subsequent speeches, both first and second inaugurals, have been significantly below the average for first inaugurals.

The average length of a second in-

TABLE I

NUMBER OF WORDS AND SENTENCES IN INAUGURAL ADDRESSES

	Words	(Rank)	Sentences	(Rank)	Word-Length of Average Sentence	(Rank)
1st Inaugurals						
Washington	1300	(26)	23	(29)	57	(2)
John Adams	2311	(18)	37	(26)	62	(1)
Jefferson	2123	(20)	41	(24)	52	(4)
Madison	1170	(27)	21	(31)	56	(3)
Monroe	3322	(11)	123	(10)	27	(21)
J. Q. Adams	2944	(14)	76	(18)	39	(10)
Jackson	1116	(29)	25	(28)	45	(6)
Van Buren	3884	(7)	98	(15)	40	(8)
Wm. Harrison	8578	(1)	214	(1)	40	(9)
Polk	4904	(3)	152	(6)	32	(14)
Taylor	1096	(30)	22	(30)	50	(5)
Pierce	3319	(12)	104	(14)	32	(15)
Buchanan	2772	(15)	89	(16)	31	(16)
Lincoln	3588	(9)	135	(8)	27	(22)
Grant	1139	(28)	40	(25)	28	(20)
Hayes	2472	(16)	59	(20)	42	(7)
Garfield	2949	(13)	111	(13)	27	(23)
Cleveland ('85)	1688	(24)	44	(23)	38	(11)
B. Harrison	4588	(4)	157	(5)	29	(19)
Cleveland ('93)	2020	(21)	58	(21)	35	(12)
McKinley	3966	(6)	130	(9)	31	(17)
T. Roosevelt	983	(31)	33	(27)	30	(18)
Taft	5425	(2)	159	(4)	34	(13)
Wilson	1699	(23)	68	(19)	25	(25)
Harding	3325	(10)	148	(7)	22	(27)
Coolidge	4054	(5)	196	(2)	21	(29)
Hoover	3704	(8)	164	(3)	23	(26)
F. Roosevelt	1883	(22)	85	(17)	22	(28)
Truman	2171	(19)	116	(12)	19	(31)
Eisenhower	2442	(17)	119	(11)	21	(30)
Kennedy	1355	(25)	52	(22)	26	(24)
Totals:	88290		2899			
Averages:	2848		94		34	
2nd Inaugurals						
Washington	134	(13)	4	(13)	34	(4)
Jefferson	2159	(3)	45	(7)	48	(1)
Madison	1142	(10)	33	(9)	35	(3)
Monroe	4466	(1)	131	(1)	34	(5)
Jackson	1167	(9)	30	(10)	39	(2)
Lincoln	588	(11)	26	(11)	23	(8)
Grant	1332	(8)	44	(8)	30	(6)
McKinley	2215	(2)	100	(2)	22	(10)
Wilson	1526	(6)	59	(6)	26	(7)
F. Roosevelt II	1800	(4)	96	(3)	19	(12)
F. Roosevelt III	1342	(7)	68	(5)	20	(11)
F. Roosevelt IV	557	(12)	24	(12)	23	(9)
Eisenhower	1651	(5)	92	(4)	18	(13)
Totals:	20079		752			
Averages:	1545		58		29	
Averages 1st and 2nd Inaugurals:	2463		84		33	

augural address is only 1545 words. Washington's second inaugural is only 134 words long and is by far the shortest. The 4466-word second inaugural of Monroe is twice as long as any other second inaugural. Twentieth-century second inaugurals have averaged 1565 words.

Table I presents a listing of the word length of all inaugural addresses. The number in parentheses following each word total indicates the word length rank order ("1" means the longest address; "31," the shortest first inaugural). Although there have been thirty-five presidents, four—Tyler, Fillmore, Johnson, and Arthur—succeeded from the vice presidency and did not deliver presidential inaugurals. Second inaugurals are ranked separately, "1" through "13." The statistically average inaugural address, including both first and second inaugurals, contains 2463 words.

Is there a relation between political party and the length of an inaugural address? A comparison of the word length of the first ten first inaugurals spoken by Democrats (Jackson through Truman) with the first ten inaugurals delivered by Republicans (Lincoln through Coolidge) discloses that the Democrats averaged 703 words per speech less than the Republicans. In a further comparison of the word length of the ten most recent first inaugurals by Democrats (Kennedy to Van Buren) with the ten most recent first inaugurals by Republicans (Eisenhower to Hayes), Democrats averaged 821 words per speech less than the Republicans. In only one comparison, that of the first ten inaugurals, is this tendency reversed. In this instance Democrats averaged a mere 28 words per speech *more* than the Republicans. But the most convincing case of all for Democratic brevity is found by comparing the ten most recent speeches of each party, including both first and second inaugurals. This comparison of inaugurals from Cleveland to Kennedy with those of Benjamin Harrison to Eisenhower reveals an average word length per speech for Democrats of 1604 and for Republicans of 3235. Here the Democrats average 1631 words per speech less than the Republicans. And Kennedy has supplied an emphatic example of this trend.

What does an inspection of the inaugural sentence reveal? Inaugural sentences range in length from two to 730 words. As a concluding sentence for his review of the events leading to the Spanish-American War, McKinley said, "It came" (II:21).[6] In a sentence of poetic beauty and syntactical sagacity, John Adams turned from praise of his predecessor to a declaration of principles of "preference":

> On this subject it might become me better to be silent or to speak with diffidence; but as something may be expected, the occasion, I hope, will be admitted as an apology if I venture to say that if a preference, upon principle, of a free republican government, formed upon long and serious reflection, after a diligent and impartial inquiry after truth; if an attachment to the Constitution of the United States, and a conscientious determination to support it until it shall be altered by the judgments and wishes of the people, expressed in the mode prescribed in it; if a respectful attention to the constitutions of the individual States and a constant caution and delicacy toward the State governments; if an equal and impartial regard to the rights, interest, honor, and happiness of all the States in the Union,

[6] The McKinley quotation is from his second inaugural address, sentence number 21. Hereafter the source of inaugural address quotations is identified in parentheses following their appearance, such as "(Lincoln I:15)" meaning Lincoln's first inaugural, sentence 15. Where the president is identified in the text, the shortened form "(II:20)," indicating the president's second inaugural, sentence 20, is used. When the president quoted is identified in the text and has only one inaugural address, a reference such as "(25)," meaning sentence number 25, will complete the identification of the source.

without preference or regard to a northern or southern, an eastern or western, position, their various political opinions on unessential points or their personal attachments; if a love of virtuous men of all parties and denominations; if a love of science and letters and a wish to patronize every rational effort to encourage schools, colleges, universities, academies, and every institution for propagating knowledge, virtue, and religion among all classes of the people, not only for their benign influence on the happiness of life in all its stages and classes, and of society in all its forms, but as the only means of preserving our Constitution from its natural enemies, the spirit of sophistry, the spirit of the party, the spirit of intrigue, the profligacy of corruption, and the pestilence of foreign influence, which is the angel of destruction to elective governments; if a love of equal laws, of justice, and humanity toward the aboriginal nations of America, and a disposition to meliorate their condition by inclining them to be more friendly to us, and our citizens to be more friendly to them; if an inflexible determination to maintain peace and inviolable faith with all nations, and that system of neutrality and impartiality among the belligerent powers of Europe which has been adopted by this Government and so solemnly sanctioned by both Houses of Congress and applauded by the legislatures of the States and the public opinion, until it shall be otherwise ordained by Congress; if a personal esteem for the French nation, formed in a residence of seven years chiefly among them, and a sincere desire to preserve the friendship which has been so much for the honor and interest of both nations; if, while the conscious honor and integrity of the people of America and the internal sentiment of their own power and energies must be preserved, an earnest endeavor to investigate every just cause and remove every colorable pretense of complaint; if an intention to pursue by amicable negotiation a reparation for the injuries that have been committed on the commerce of our fellow-citizens by whatever nation, and if success can not be obtained, to lay the facts before the Legislature, that they may consider what further measures the honor and interest of the Government and its constituents demand; if a resolution to do justice as far as may depend upon me, at all times and to all nations, and maintain peace, friendship, and benevolence with all the world; if an unshaken confidence in the honor, spirit, and resources of the American people, on which I have so often hazarded my all and never been deceived; if elevated ideas of the high destinies of this country and of my own duties toward it, founded on a knowledge of the moral principles and intellectual improvements of the people deeply engraven on my mind in early life, and not obscured but exalted by experience and age; and, with humble reverence, I feel it to be my duty to add, if a veneration for the religion of a people who profess and call themselves Christians, and a fixed resolution to consider a decent respect for Christianity among the best recommendations for the public service, can enable me in any degree to comply with your wishes, it shall be my strenuous endeavor that this sagacious injunction of the two Houses shall not be without effect (35).

This sentence of Adams abundantly illustrates what can be called the inaugural "chock-full" sentence. Particularly in vogue among the earlier presidents, the "chock-full" sentence is usually long and contains from five to fifteen different specific subject assertions. Adams' sentence opened this tradition and contained eleven specific subject assertions. Four years later, Jefferson used a similar sentence comprised of fifteen specific subject assertions (I:29). Madison's "chock-full" sentence was one of 375 words which made assertions about fourteen different specific subjects (I:16).

Such sentences often contain the bulk of the president's policy statements. In the inaugurals of J. Q. Adams, Taylor, and in the second inaugural of Grant one may find additional examples of the "chock-full" sentence. The first inaugural of Wilson revived the tradition; the president began his sentence with these words, "We have itemized with some degree of particularity the things that ought to be altered and here are some of the chief items: A tarriff . . ." (I:42). Sentence 191 in the Coolidge inaugural is of this type. Two such sentences are found in the inaugural address of Hoover. Sentence

141 enumerates what he terms "important further mandates from the recent election." A few lines later one finds a 123-word sentence which signals the final example of this characteristic of inaugural sentence style. President Kennedy did not revive this waning tradition.

Table I indicates the sentence total of each inaugural with the rank order of the speech in relation to the total number of sentences in other inaugural addresses. Also represented is the word-length of the average sentence for each inaugural. Revealed is a rather marked stylistic change during the long course of inaugural addresses. The longest average sentences tend to reflect an earlier period. Average sentence length has dropped from a high of 62 words per sentence in the inaugural of John Adams to the low average sentence length of 18 words in the second inaugural of Eisenhower. The shortening of the inaugural sentence has been quite gradual and had been remarkably constant until January 20, 1961. Reversed in just fourteen minutes was a 44-year trend. Kennedy's average sentence length of 26 words puts him in stylistic league with Wilson.

The statistically average first inaugural has 94 sentences, each averaging 34 words in length. The average second inaugural has 58 sentences, each averaging 29 words in length. Since nearly one half of all second inaugurals are products of the twentieth century, the shorter average second inaugural sentence is readily explained.[7] The statistical average of all inaugural addresses yields an average of 84 sentences per speech, with each sentence composed of 33 words.

Inaugural salutations boast both a primary and a secondary tradition. Kennedy followed them both when he began, "Vice President Johnson, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chief Justice, President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, President Truman, Reverend Clergy, Fellow Citizens." Franklin Roosevelt initiated the secondary tradition of recognizing specific members of the audience. In 1945 Roosevelt began in this way: "Mr. Chief Justice, Mr. Vice President, my friends." Truman followed the pattern. In 1957 Eisenhower continued the tradition with significant augmentation: "Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice President, Mr. Chief Justice, Mr. Speaker, members of my family and friends, my countrymen, and friends of my country, wherever they may be."

To be consistent with primary tradition, the president must include the salutation "Fellow Citizens." This custom began in 1789 when Washington addressed the "Fellow-Citizens of the Senate and of the House of Representatives." To begin a speech abounding in unity appeals, Jefferson employed, "Friends and Fellow-Citizens." Consistency prevailed until Pierce used the original "My countrymen." Buchanan reverted to "Fellow-Citizens." In 1861 Lincoln significantly used the salutation, "Fellow-Citizens of the United States"; to precede his second inaugural, Lincoln created, "Fellow-Countrymen." Perhaps Grant was influenced by Lincoln's example; in 1869 Grant began with the words, "Citizens of the United States."

"Fellow-Citizens" preceded all inaugural addresses from 1873 to Cleveland's 1893 innovation, "My fellow citizens." McKinley followed the Cleveland example by using "Fellow-Citizens" in 1897 and "My Fellow-Citizens" in 1901. Taft once and Wilson twice used the popular "My Fellow Citizens." Harding reached back to the example of Pierce

[7] For the purposes of this study and statistical facility, Franklin Roosevelt's second, third, and fourth inaugurals were classified as second inaugurals.

and used the salutation, "My Countrymen." Republicans Coolidge and Hoover continued with "My Countrymen."

The inaugural address of John F. Kennedy contains what might be called an internal and international salutation. When he said, "My fellow citizens of the world: Ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man" (50), was it an inaugural innovation, merely stylistic emphasis, or the exercise of ambiguity?

If indeed the sentence were addressed to all but American citizens, it stands as a uniquely direct international salutation. However, in view of the Eisenhower inaugurals, the Kennedy internal salutation may appear as but stylistic variation. In 1953, Eisenhower said, "We wish our friends the world over to know this above all: we face . . ." (69). And in his 1957 address Eisenhower declared, "In Europe, we ask that enlightened and inspired leaders . . ." (90). The suggestion of ambiguity arises when we consider that American citizens are as much "citizens of the world" as any to be found. In fact it was Franklin Roosevelt on January 20, 1945, who observed, "We have learned to be citizens of the world, members of the human community" (17). Based on the evidence of context and vocal inflection, it would seem that Kennedy's audience experienced an expression new to the inaugural salutation tradition.

Once into their address, with what issues do the presidents deal? Space does not permit a detailed answer but some verifiable conclusions are clear. What the presidents say about specific issues traditionally tends to center around what to them were the principal issues of their day. Domestic issues play a much larger role in the nineteenth-century inaugurals, and inaugural attention to international affairs rises sharply in the twentieth century.

The issues most frequently treated from Washington to Truman were those concerning interpretations of our form of government. Such concepts as democracy, function and powers of the general government, executive function and power, relations with state governments, citizen equality, freedom and justice were treated by many presidents. Not all presidents have treated these issues, but such issues have consumed the length of more issue-bearing inaugural sentences than any other.

International interpretations, such as assertions about war and peace, freedom, justice, international brotherhood, references to foreign peoples, their problems and ideologies rank just behind domestic governmental interpretations as popular issues for inaugural addresses. Madison spoke about "the injustice and violence of the belligerent powers" (I:11). Kennedy requested "that both sides begin anew the quest for peace . . ." (23).

Although it hasn't appeared in an inaugural address since 1937, the third most common issue from Jefferson to Franklin Roosevelt was the concept of frugality and efficiency in governmental operations. Despite the fact that not a dissenting inaugural assertion was ever recorded about this issue, Coolidge marshalled twenty-one sentences in support of economy in government. Said he: "I favor the policy of economy, not because I wish to save money, but because I wish to save people" (120).

Ranking fourth as an issue for inaugural attention are assertions which reveal how the president feels the United States should relate herself to other nations. Most of our presidents from John Adams to Kennedy have declared themselves for friendly cooperation. Adams advocated an "inviolable faith with all

nations" (35). Kennedy pledged to our old allies "the loyalty of faithful friends" (10). Some presidents, especially those of the twentieth century, have also included a tougher line. In 1953 Eisenhower spoke of "the futility of appeasement; we shall never try to placate an aggressor . . ." (I:78). Kennedy said, "And let every other power know that this hemisphere intends to remain the master of its own house" (21).

Specific domestic and foreign issues holding frequency rankings from five through ten are these: national finance, the tariff, comments about the Constitution, remarks about domestic lands and territories, references to our military establishment and, in tenth place, international economic relations. The only specific domestic issue raised by Kennedy concerned our military establishment: "For only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be employed" (25).

How much of an inaugural address is apt to deal with domestic issues and how much with international affairs? In Table II, all inaugural content is shown for "Domestic Issues" and for "International Relations." Also included in the table is a grouping of items under "American Tradition," comment upon America or Americans, and the drawing upon American history. A fourth column in the table, called "Other," accounts for such content as non-specific expository remarks, unity appeals, divine invocations, ambiguous sentences, and other non-specific references.

Table II suggests a consistent increase in first inaugural address assertions about international affairs. Washington was silent on the subject of foreign affairs. In 1953, 36% of Eisenhower's first inaugural assertions were about international issues. Kennedy confirmed this trend with the figure of 44%. It should be noted that the pattern of increase for international issues parallels a rather even decrease in content about domestic affairs. Kennedy's figure of 4% for domestic issues provides an unusually sharp de-emphasis.

TABLE II
CHRONOLOGY OF INAUGURAL CONTENT IN FOUR CATEGORIES

	Domestic Issues Percentage	International Relations Percentage	American Tradition Percentage	Other Percentage
First Inaugural Addresses:				
Washington through Polk	42	3	32	23
Taylor through Cleveland ('93)	47	6	20	27
McKinley through Eisenhower	31	19	22	28
Averages Pre-Kennedy:	40	9	25	26
Kennedy	4	44	15	37
Averages All 1st Inaugurals:	38	11	24	27
Second Inaugural Addresses:				
Washington through Monroe	22	14	33	31
Jackson through McKinley	23	14	25	38
Wilson through Eisenhower	16	25	26	33
Averages 2nd Inaugurals:	19	19	28	34
Averages 1st and 2nd Inaugurals:	34	13	25	28

Just under fifty per cent of Washington's first inaugural contained non-specific praise, blame, or comment on America or Americans. This topic has continued to be a popular avenue of inaugural expression. In 1961, "the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans . . ." (Kennedy:7).

All inaugural addresses contain sentences which are not assertions about specific subjects. Certain transitional remarks are among the content described

in the category "Other." Sentence nine in the Kennedy inaugural illustrates a typical transitional remark: "This much we pledge—and more." The figure of thirty-seven per cent of Kennedy's content which falls in the "Other" column is not greatly different from percentage figures based on other shorter inaugural addresses.

Perhaps in no instance is the inaugural tradition stronger than in effecting a climactic close. Certain patterns are quite discernible. A president who follows the style of the majority will conclude his inaugural address with a divine invocation. Washington set the pace in this regard with an effusive quality that has never been surpassed:

> Having thus imparted to you my sentiments as they have been awakened by the occasion which brings us together, I shall take my present leave; but not without resorting once more to the benign Parent of the Human Race in humble supplication that, since He has been pleased to favor the American people with opportunities for deliberating in perfect tranquillity, and dispositions for deciding with unparalleled unanimity on a form of government for the security of their union and the advancement of their happiness, so His divine blessing may be equally conspicuous in the enlarged views, the temperate consultations, and the wise measures on which the success of the Government must depend (I:23).

Eisenhower employed this sentence to close his first inaugural address: "This is the work that awaits us all, to be done with bravery, with charity, and with prayer to Almighty God" (I:119). Twenty-one presidents have concluded with a Divine invocation.

Seven other presidents closed by augmenting the Divine invocation with an appeal for unity. In 1801 Jefferson said: "Relying, then, on the patronage of your good will, I advance with obedience to the work, ready to retire from it whenever you become sensible how much better choice it is in your power to make. And may that Infinite Power which rules the destinies of the universe lead our councils to what is best, and give them a favorable issue for your peace and prosperity" (I:40-1).

Four inaugural addresses conclude with praise for America. The final sentences of the Coolidge inaugural fully illustrate this: "America seeks no earthly empire built on blood and force. No ambition, no temptation, lures her to thought of foreign dominions. The legions which she sends forth are armed, not with the sword, but with the cross. The higher state to which she seeks the allegiance of all mankind is not of human, but of divine origin. She cherishes no purpose save to merit the favor of Almighty God" (192-6).

"Exhortation" is the classification which may be given to sentences wherein the speaker incites the audience to virtuous thought or action. Five presidents concluded their inaugurals in this manner. The final sentence of Lincoln's first inaugural is an impressive example. In 1917 Wilson used these words: "The shadows that now lie dark upon our path will soon be dispelled, and we shall walk with the light all about us if we be but true to ourselves—to ourselves as we have wished to be known in the counsels of the world and in the thought of all those who love liberty and justice and the right exalted" (II:59).

President Kennedy combined effectively the elements of exhortation with a Divine invocation: "With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on Earth God's work must truly be our own" (52).

In summary, what conclusions can be drawn from a comparison of the Kennedy address with inaugural tradition? Only by its brevity did the speech make

a significant departure from traditional first inaugural addresses. In this respect, as well as by issue selection, the address more closely follows the tradition of a *second* inaugural address. With some exceptions, presidents have typically been more domestic-minded in first inaugurals and have given more attention to international issues in a second inaugural address.[8]

The address of Kennedy ranks above the average inaugural in emotional color. Few inaugurals carry as high a percentage of sentences of exhortation. Even fewer have used an illustration as picturesque as the admonition that "those who foolishly sought power by riding the back of the tiger ended up inside" (15).

During fourteen minutes of an announced "celebration of freedom," Americans received the inaugural address of John F. Kennedy—a speech quite consistent with the broad outline of inaugural tradition.

[8] The best and most recent example of second inaugural focus on international issues is Eisenhower's 1957 address, which bears the title, "The Price of Peace."

ANDREW D. WHITE: SPOKESMAN FOR THE FREE UNIVERSITY

Donald E. Williams

IN a day when religious tests are almost universally rejected as entrance or employment requirements among institutions of higher learning and when church-sponsored colleges continuously strive to improve their curricula of liberal education, it is difficult to comprehend how completely higher education *circa* 1860 was controlled by narrow sectarianism. Colleges were channels through which sects could be perpetuated.[1] Before the Civil War, each aspiring denomination wanted at least one college in every state and, preferably, in every region within a state.[2] Struggling to cut down one another in this sectarian empire building contest, the colleges, however, joined to thwart attempts to establish state supported schools. Secure in their virtual monopoly, religious denominations shaped the purpose of higher education to accommodate their own ends. They often placed sectarian affiliation above subject competence as a qualification for professors; ordained ministers were usually more numerous than laymen on college faculties, particularly in presidential chairs.[3]

Zealous sectarianism's educational philosophy eschewed experimentalism; serious search, questioning, and doubt —the elements of all true intellectual adventure—were generally branded whimsical or even heretical.[4] The curriculum featured a four-year drill in classical languages; day after day, students learned vocabulary, studied grammatical usage, translated Latin into English, and memorized assigned pages in textbooks. Learning in the more speculative disciplines, when these received any attention at all, was forced to harmonize with a priori theological assumptions.[5] The 1827 *Yale Report* provided easy rationalization for these educational practices. It declared that the primary purpose of higher education was to discipline the mind and that the best means by which this could be achieved was the traditional classical curriculum.[6]

Both churchmen and educators, then, simply stated the role of the colleges: They were to preserve and to transmit faithfully that body of knowledge which the past had decreed to be entirely sound, safe, and sufficient. Sectarianism was everlastingly enthroned, it seemed, even though college enrollments steadily declined.[7] Occasional outbursts of criticism of the denominational system before 1860 had been spasmodic and isolated, and their effects meager.[8]

As a practical-minded nation emerged

Mr. Williams is Assistant Professor of Speech, University of Florida.

[1] Richard Hofstadter and Walter P. Metzger, *The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States* (New York, 1955), pp. 294-295.

[2] John S. Brubacher and Willis Rudy, *Higher Education in Transition* (New York, 1958), p. 71.

[3] Hofstadter and Metzger, pp. 298-299.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 283-284.

[5] Willis Rudy, "The 'Revolution' in American Higher Education—1865-1900," *Harvard Educational Review*, XXI (1951), 157.

[6] E. Kidd Lockard, "The Influence of New England in Denominational Colleges in the Northwest, 1830-1860," *Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Quarterly*, LIII (1944), 5.

[7] *Annual Report of the President of Columbia College* (New York, 1870), pp. 40-62.

[8] Hofstadter and Metzger, pp. 302-303.

from its Civil War, this state of affairs in higher education was incongruous with the times. The industrial age was following the church age. Men who had studied at the great universities in Europe yearned for these renowned schools to have their counterparts in this country. Many intellectuals demanded that higher education thoughtfully concern itself with the exciting issue of Darwinism—had a sinister hoax been foisted on society or had a new way of discovering truth been found?

The old order, though showing signs of weakening here and there, refused to bow; the positions taken by a new generation of outstanding educational leaders reinforced the tenacious sectarian spirit. The Rev. James McCosh, inaugurated as president of Princeton in 1868, refused to compromise his attitude toward secularism in higher education; Noah Porter, one year before assuming the presidency of Yale in 1871, emphatically defended sectarianism; Charles W. Eliot made short shrift of the secularization question when he was inaugurated as president of Harvard in 1869; in the same year, William Watts Folwell, as he became president of the University of Minnesota, sanctioned the denominational sponsorship of colleges. Many other college presidents, such as Frederick A. P. Barnard, who was inaugurated as president of Columbia in 1864, equivocated on the matter as they half-challenged and half-reassured in their public statements.[9]

In sharp contrast with these voices was a voice unmistakably bold:

> Perhaps no one thing has done more to dwarf the system of higher education in this land than the sectarian principle. . . . I declare my firm belief that, but for our enslavement to this unfortunate principle, we would long since have had great free universities, liberal and practical, the largest, the most ample in equipment, most earnest in effort, the most vigorous in thought the world has yet seen.

This was the voice of Andrew Dickson White; he was delivering his inaugural address at Ithaca, New York, on October 7, 1868, as he became the first president of Cornell University, a school partially privately endowed, partially state supported, but completely detached from all denominations.

His charges against sectarianism mounted as the speech proceeded. After he cited "the simplest facts in educational history"—instances in which competent teachers had been dismissed from colleges because of their non-adherence to particular religious beliefs, he said:

> All this is the evil growth from an evil germ. . . . The sectarian spirit has been the worst foe of enlarged university education. Place the strongest men under a spirit like this and they are robbed of half their strength. Under such a system are wanting the very foundations of an University, because the only such foundations are foundations of liberty.[10]

White's indictment of sectarian power in higher education could hardly have been more pointed. Profoundly dissatisfied with the education he had received at Hobart and Yale, where denominational influences were strong, he realized all the more how deficient the sectarian philosophy was in purpose and in function. From the time he was first interested in founding a University, he was concerned with making it "an asylum for *Science*—where truth shall be sought for truth's sake," not molded "exactly to fit 'Revealed Religion.'"[11]

[9] George P. Schmidt, "Colleges in Ferment," *American Historical Review*, LIX (1953), 32.

[10] *The Cornell University: Account of Proceedings at the Inauguration, October 7, 1868* (Ithaca, 1869), pp. 7-8.

[11] White to Gerrit Smith, September 1, 1862, Andrew D. White Collection of Personal Letters and Manuscripts. This Collection, housed in the Regional History Library at Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, is hereinafter referred to as "White MSS." As a member of the New York State Senate from 1863 to 1867, White played a major role in the founding of Cornell University, which was chartered in 1865.

White now emphasized in his inaugural address, therefore, his determination to make Cornell forever free from the restraining influence of religious creeds.

This striking pronouncement was received in many quarters with suspicion and scorn. Newspapers such as the New York *World* simultaneously expressed disagreement and guarded admiration. Commenting about the "strong originality" reflected in White's views, the *World* correspondent said:

> I thought Mr. White gave over prominence to the disclaimer of sectarian bias. Sectarianism is but another name for a human being's preference for a special channel of truth.
>
> This address was very able and fresh—a bold knocking at or in the doors of settled rules, and it will receive the careful reading of educators and educated all over civilization. . . . It challenges admiration for Cornell University, that it thus avouches boldly its peculiar ways of arriving at the truths of the physical and the intellectual. . . . It shows its heraldry somewhat red, but perhaps safely so.[12]

Editors of denominational newspapers responded more vehemently. Greatly distorting the meaning of his speech, they insisted that Cornell, with its enviable wealth, was dedicated to the propagation of atheism and infidelity; this was charged even though students attended daily religious services on a voluntary basis at the new university. Although White was a member of a Protestant church and often expressed his belief in a "higher power," his critics charged that he was an atheist. Pastors earnestly advised prospective students to go to any school other than Cornell; speakers denounced the institution in addresses on public occasions in the sectarian colleges.[13] Cornell and its president had quickly become the main target of the religionists' attack on secularism in higher education.[14] For several months, White remained on the defensive as accusations increased both in number and in severity. He hoped that discussion of the provisions made for the students' religious life would counteract the charges, but this was a futile hope as bitterness increased.[15]

For instance, as the *Northern Christian Advocate,* a leading Methodist weekly, reported Cornell's first Commencement Exercises, it warned the graduates not to be victims of "those subtle forms of infidelity which are appealing to men with all the charm and power which a specious philosophy can give them" and so become "ecclesiastical Ishmaels."[16] A week later, the *Advocate* held that secular colleges were "worse than useless" since they were "positively dangerous centers," and declared, referring specifically to Cornell, "Our state Legislatures commit a fraud upon the country by endowing such Institutions *with public funds.*"[17] Another church paper, *Zion's Herald,* confidently proclaimed that Cornell and all nondenominational schools "will be left behind by those that are truly teaching as the source and end of all learning, the Gospel, the Divinity, and the Redemption of our Lord Jesus Christ."[18]

Having read these attacks,[19] White was greatly disturbed. He confided to Ezra Cornell, the University's founder, "The papers, addresses, and sermons on our unchristian character are venom-

[12] New York *World,* October 17, 1868.

[13] Andrew D. White, *Autobiography* (New York, 1905), I, 422.

[14] Karl G. Peterson, "Andrew Dickson White's Educational Principles: Their Sources, Development, Consequences," (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1949), pp. 261-262.

[15] White, I, 425; White to the editor, *Northern Christian Advocate,* February 24, 1870.

[16] *Ibid.,* July 15, 1869.

[17] *Ibid.,* July 22, 1869.

[18] *Zion's Herald,* quoted in *Advocate, ibid.*

[19] Willard Fiske, librarian at Cornell, to White, August 5, 1869, White MSS.

ous."[20] Finally, White determined to take the offensive.[21] An invitation to appear in New York City as the first lecturer in a popular course of scientific lectures sponsored by the American Institute provided the occasion for him to begin his campaign. The Institute encouraged him to choose a topic that would enable him "to point out the defects in the old system of education."[22] In the series which White's lecture was to open, addresses were to be made on such technical subjects as "The Theory of Respiration," "The Constitution of the Sun," and "The Ruined Cities of the Colorado Plateau."[23] With the purpose of the series being to encourage the serious study of the sciences, it was most fitting that the initial lecture be a reply to the critics of the Cornell idea.

White gladly accepted the invitation. Realizing that he faced a difficult problem in composing his speech, he sought advice. A friend cautioned him:

> Unless carefully drawn it [the forthcoming speech] may expose the institution to new attacks; for some of these assailants are probably lying in wait, as the Jews did for the Saviour's words, that they might entangle Him in His words.[24]

The result of his careful preparation was the speech he presented on the evening of December 17, 1869, in New York City's favorite meeting place and one of its leading cultural centers, Cooper Union.[25] Entitled "The Battlefields of Science," the speech was given to an audience which filled the great hall.[26]

In his arresting introduction, White used the language of the military to carry forth the spirit suggested by the title of the speech.[27] He invited his listeners to go with him "through some of these most-determined sieges, and over some of the hardest-fought battle-fields of the great war." He spoke of the "great sacred struggle for the liberty of Science," its "combatants," their "battle-cries," "the strategy of leaders, the cut and thrust of champions, the weight of missiles, the temper of weapons." White then stated his "thesis":

> In all modern history, interference with Science in the supposed interest of religion—no matter how conscientious such interference may have been—has resulted in the direst evils both to Religion and Science, and *invariably*. And on the other hand all untrammeled scientific investigation, no matter how dangerous to religion some of its stages may have seemed, temporarily, to be, has invariably resulted in the highest good of Religion and Science.

Next came the tour of the battlefields. One by one, the areas of investigation in which religion had clashed with science were discussed—cosmography, astronomy, chemistry, anatomy, geology; and one by one, scholars who were persecuted because they were dedicated to the cause of free inquiry were extolled —Kopernik (Copernicus), Bruno, Galileo, Newton, Kepler, Vesalius. In explaining how two important weapons of churchmen—doctrines of theology and rigid, literal interpretations of the Scriptures—were used, White gave details of the controversies over the discoveries of scientists, described the victories of the enemies of science, and depicted the struggles of the learning impulse to assert itself. As each incident in the narrative was related, the negative effects of organized religion's at-

[20] White to Ezra Cornell, August 3, 1869, quoted in Philip Dorf, *The Builder: A Biography of Ezra Cornell* (New York, 1952), p. 376.

[21] White, I, 425.

[22] Samuel D. Tillman to White, October 12, 1869, White MSS.

[23] *New York Tribune*, December 18, 1869.

[24] E. H. Andrews to White, November 27, 1869, White MSS.

[25] Edward C. Mack, *Peter Cooper* (New York, 1949), p. 331.

[26] *New York Herald*, December 18, 1869.

[27] *New York Tribune*, December 18, 1869. This issue carried the text of the complete speech.

tacks on the liberalization of learning became more strikingly apparent.

White made his message more vital as he concluded his speech. He warned his audience that this intellectual warfare "breaks out in America not less than in France," and referred to his own recent tribulations:

> I have seen within the last year the most perverted statements of words uttered in the lecture rooms of an American University, circulated by excellent men, who in their eagerness believed them. I have seen phrases used in lectures by Christian Professors at such an institution eked out and pieced out with prefixes and affixes, and substitutions and suppositions, until they became monstrous perversions, and then I have seen them used to prove that scientific education is unsafe, and that an unsectarian institution must be unchristian.

He ended the speech on a decidedly optimistic note. He spoke of "cheering omens" and he spoke of the growing interest among men of learning in theology and natural science to fuse seemingly varying truths. With science studied according to its own methods, with its findings not molded to fit scriptural dicta, White claimed that the result would strengthen both religion and science.

The speech made the case for the free university. As White defined true religion as something far nobler than narrow theology, he demonstrated how organized religion had consistently been the enemy, rather than the friend, of science. Here was the long narrative of clashes; here were appeals to the inherent goodness of men, to their love of freedom, to their sense of revulsion toward the misguided dogmatism of the past; here was the speaker who had much reason to be dismayed and harsh toward his fellow men, but who instead saw his adversaries as well intentioned men, as "excellent" men; here also was the speaker who chose to speak of hope instead of despair. Furthermore, while he was firm throughout his attack, he was not rancorous; the salient feature of the speech was exposition, not vituperation.

"It is the clear ring of a bell on cloudy air,"[28] was representative of the many favorable comments which White received after the speech. Encouraged by this reception and convinced all the more that the "regime of petty Sectarian Colleges," which he now saw as "laboring in secret,"[29] should be overthrown, White urged George William Curtis, whose name was well known, to sound a "rallying call to all those interested in freedom."[30]

Having been catapulted into the public eye in a manner he had not known before, White himself had many opportunities during the next several years to sound such a call. He repeated again and again the speech by which he had forthrightly assumed the mantle of leadership in the unsectarian movement.[31] During the years 1869 to 1876, he was sponsored as a lecturer by such organizations as the Free Religious Association in Cambridge, the Young Men's Christian Association in Utica, the Lecture Association at the University of Michigan, the North Presbyterian Church in Buffalo, and the University of Illinois, in connection with its commencement week activities. He also spoke in Ithaca, Syracuse, Boston, New Haven, and Providence, and in other towns and cities. Speaking before "general public" audiences in addition to

[28] Elias Lewis, Jr., to White, December 18, 1869, White MSS.

[29] White to Edward P. Evans, June 11, 1870, White MSS.

[30] White to George W. Curtis, November 1, 1870, quoted in Peterson, p. 196.

[31] The lecture, which lasted almost two hours, changed little. The address given at Cambridge in 1875 was essentially the same in form, content, and wording as his Cooper Union speech in 1869. See *Boston Daily Globe*, January 11, 1875.

learned audiences, he became known to many people more as the spokesman for the cause of the free university than as anything else, even though he spoke on various topics related to higher education.[32] As he gained this reputation for himself, he no longer defended the Cornell idea, in particular, as he had done before he spoke at Cooper Union; he now argued for a fundamental principle which related to the enterprise of higher education in its totality.

White did not limit himself to the defense of Darwin's theory of evolution; Darwinism, per se, was defended in popular lectures by such men as the celebrated British biologist, Thomas H. Huxley, and the Professor of Zoology at Bowdoin College, Edward S. Morse. Moreover, it was not White's primary purpose to reconcile scientific discoveries with biblical teachings; R. Ogden Doremus, Professor of Chemistry and Physics at the College of the City of New York, and other public lecturers spoke directly on this topic. In essence, White contended that science, as a field of intellectual exploration honorable in its objective and tried in its methods, should be its own master—never to be subjected to any form of religious control. Had he defended Darwinism at all, he probably would have defended the scientific research techniques used to arrive at knowledge, rather than the conclusions.

White had a keen appreciation for the problems of oral communciation. Having long deplored what he called "rhetorical fustian and oratorical tall-talk," he tried to give his speaking the quality of "clean, clear straightforward statement and illustration."[33] As a result, his wording, although flashing color, was functional instead of ornamental. When he used figurative language, he sustained images without permitting stylistic techniques to blur his message. His discussion of the principal weapons of the enemies of science, the epithets "Infidel" and "Atheist," illustrates the utilitarian nature of his style:

> These can hardly be classed with civilized weapons; they are burning arrows; they set fire to great masses of popular prejudices. Smoke rises to obscure the real questions. Fire bursts out at times to destroy the attacked party. They are poisoned weapons. They go to the heart of loving women; they alienate dear children; they injure the man after life is ended, for they leave poisoned wounds in the hearts of those who loved him best—fears for his eternal happiness, dread of the Divine displeasure. The battle-fields of Science are thickly strewn with these.

Figurative language was also used to sustain the image of stifled ideas gradually achieving acceptance:

> The germs of the Heliocentric theory had been planted long before, and well planted; it had seemed ready even to bloom forth in the mind of Cardinal de Cusa, but the chill of dogmatism was still over the earth, and up to the beginning of the sixteenth century there had come to this great truth neither bloom nor fruitage. Quietly, however, the soil was receiving enrichment and the air warmth.

Although there was little in White's speeches to suggest the turgid style of the period, his subject itself, dealing with little-known facts of history as it did, demanded scholarly treatment. Reporters often commented that he treated his subject in "the most masterly manner, showing himself to be a close student, a ripe scholar and an industrious gleaner among the histories and records

[32] Walter P. Rogers, *Andrew D. White and the Modern University* (Ithaca, 1942), p. 81. White's interest in the subject motivated him to expand the speech, gradually, into a long article which appeared in two installments in *Popular Science Monthly*, VIII (February and March, 1876), 385 and 553; a small book, *The Warfare of Science* (New York, 1876); a series of further discussions in *Popular Science Monthly;* and finally into a two-volume work called *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom* (New York), which first appeared in 1896 and still has wide circulation.

[33] White, I, 363-364.

of the past.[34] The Cooper Union audience probably admired this cultured quality, since it was comprised of people from the upper middle class,[35] but less well educated audiences did not share this admiration. The *Utica Morning Herald,* for instance, in announcing White's lecture, thought it necessary to assure its readers that although the address would be "of a high order," it would "yet . . . gratify a popular audience."[36]

Being a teacher of history, White relied principally on historical narrative to support his unsectarian thesis. He once stated that "the best of all methods in presenting every subject bearing on political and social life is the historical."[37] This emphasis on the past, however, may have constituted a handicap in terms of his purpose. Extensively treating the past effects of religion's antagonism toward science and barely mentioning the current effects of the strife, he used a different approach from that used in his inaugural. By making such remarks as, "In these days these weapons . . . are somewhat blunted," and, "Luckily the world has learned something since the days of Galileo and Vesalius," White suggested that the problem had largely disappeared. The allusion at Cooper Union to Cornell's difficulties was not enough to establish a general, urgent need for action. Many listeners, therefore, may have thought the problem more remote than proximate. His Ann Arbor audience, for instance, according to the *Chronicle,* was not made aware of any immediate problem: "As no general conclusions were drawn, the only information to be gained from the lecture was from the historical references to individual cases of those who had suffered for the sake of science."[38] According to the student newspaper, White's audience at the University of Illinois made no application of his message to current affairs: "He . . . told us so many interesting facts in such fitting words and well chosen expression as [he] completely charmed us."[39]

Even the practical, past effects of the long battle between religion and science may not have been fully realized by his listeners. While describing these consequences as "wholly bad" and "sad, indeed," he went no further than to say, in various ways, that had the two great factions encouraged each other, "Humanity would have been spared the long and fearful war which ensued, and Religion would have saved to herself thousands on thousands of the best and brightest men in after ages." Even though this was indeed a sobering thought, a greater impact could have been made had he discussed effects in more concrete terms. For instance, what horrible diseases were left to plague men after Vesalius was forbidden to dissect human bodies in his anatomical research? Specific results such as these were not included, and although White's chain of cause-effect reasoning was complete, he did not realize the potential rhetorical impact of his logical thought. This lack of development may not have been a handicap at Cooper Union and Boston, since friends of science and educational reform comprised these audiences,[40] but when White spoke to listeners who were apathetic to the problems of science and education, this significant shortcoming surely limited him in his communication.

[34] *Champaign County Gazette* (Champaign, Illinois), June 11, 1873.
[35] Robert J. Greef, "Public Lectures in New York, 1851-1878: A Cultural Index of the Times," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1941), p. 40.
[36] *Utica Morning Herald,* October 14, 1870.
[37] White, I, 381.
[38] Ann Arbor *Chronicle,* December 14, 1872.
[39] *The Student,* University of Illinois campus newspaper, June, 1873.
[40] Greef, p. 42.

Nevertheless, as one of White's students wrote, he made the world of which he did speak "live."[41] This quality can't be missed in reviewing his lectures on the sectarian issue. He often relied on active verbs, present tense, and action phrases to achieve dramatic force. His story of what happened when Copernicus finally ventured to publish his work illustrates this usage:

> At last, he prepares his great work on the Revolution of the Heavenly Bodies, and dedicates it to the Pope himself. The work was intrusted to the scholar Osiander of Nuremberg to superintend its publication. But, at the last moment, the courage of Osiander failed him. He dared not launch the new thought boldly. He writes a groveling preface—endeavors to excuse Kopernik for his novel idea. He inserts the apologetic lie that Kopernik propounds the doctrine of the movement of the earth, not as a *fact* but as a *hypothesis*. He declares that it is lawful for an astronomer to indulge his imagination, and that this is what Kopernik has done. Thus was the greatest and most ennobling, perhaps, of scientific truths —a truth not less ennobling to Religion than to Science—forced, in coming into the world, to sneak and crawl.

White's speaking manner reflected his realistic attitude toward the communication process. After James A. Garfield had spoken on the currency question in Ithaca in 1878, White referred to the speech as the most effective political speech he had ever heard. The aspect of Garfield's speaking which impressed him the most was the speaker's engaging manner. White described it as being "kindly, hearty, as of neighbor with neighbor,—indeed, every person present, even if greenbacker or demagogue, must have said within himself, 'This man is a friend arguing with friends; he makes me his friend, and now speaks to me as such.' "[42] White himself personified this trait which he admired in Garfield; his desire to communicate was clearly evident—not to the point of being grating but rather in suggesting earnestness in purpose.

It is not surprising, therefore, that White was never a slave to his carefully written manuscripts. He broke away from them "for an anecdote, a personal experience, a direct appeal. He would leave his desk, come to the edge of his platform, and 'just talk.' "[43] Fastidious in dress, a man of barely middle stature, slender, brown-haired, bearded,[44] White always employed a manner of delivery described as "attractive and polished."[45] His platform presence never elicited reports such as the one made of the Rev. Octavius B. Frothingham's speech on human nature. Frothingham, an outspoken liberal churchman, preceded White in a Boston lecture course; according to the *Boston Daily Globe,* he "was frequently applauded for his caustic thrusts and grand climaxes of oratory and rhetoric."[46] This description would have been utterly inconsistent with White's calm, yet earnest, manner.

Speaking in a voice "round, strong, and flexible,"[47] this learned man was a teacher at heart, not a contentious arguer eager to enter the fray. When he spoke in political campaigns, he did so more because of a sense of duty than because of personal enjoyment. Even though he accepted various political appointments, he always left the political platform with a feeling of relief.[48] He was not surprised when his political speeches failed to stir popular audiences.[49] He believed that few speeches ever "converted" opponents,[50] but he had great faith in man's ability to re-

[41] George Lincoln Burr, "Andrew Dickson White," *Dictionary of American Biography* (New York, 1936), XX, 90.
[42] White, I, 186-187.
[43] Burr, p. 90.
[44] *Ibid.*, p. 92.
[45] *Utica Morning Herald,* October 15, 1870.
[46] *Boston Daily Globe,* January 4, 1875.
[47] White, I, 33.
[48] *Ibid.*, pp. 172, 210.
[49] *Ibid.*, p. 148.
[50] *Ibid.*, p. 115.

spond to meaningful instruction. White was happiest when he was teaching, and there is basis to believe that he thought himself teaching, rather than arguing, whether he was in the classroom or on the public platform, whatever his subject.[51]

White was also especially aware of the role of structure in speech composition; effect was calculated to stem from form as well as from idea. Convinced "that the first and best thing to do is to *set people at thinking*, and to let them discover, or think that they discover, the truth for themselves,"[52] he realized the practical value of the implicative pattern. He hoped that his listeners would infer from his "teaching" that sectarian practices should be supplanted by a more liberal educational philosophy—a philosophy primarily *educational* rather than *primarily* religious.[53] Yet this conclusion was not laboriously *defended* in his speeches; rather, the basis for its acceptance was *explained*. In this respect, his "Battlefields" speech differed greatly from his inaugural, and while the approach probably succeeded in allaying antagonism and encouraging objective listening; the value of his implicative attack would have been enhanced if his speech materials, as mentioned earlier, had featured more urgency, proximity, and concreteness.

Speaking for the cause of the free university, White was frequently labelled "anti-church." Although he said that Christianity's work for science "has been great, it has fostered science often and developed it, it has given great minds to it," he never developed these remarks so that the extent of his interest in organized religion became apparent. In proportion to his criticisms of theologians, his favorable comments regarding the church and its work were minor. This noticeable unbalance was unfortunate for White's purpose; unwarranted suspicion was all the more encouraged. In view of the charges which had consistently been made against him before and after he had spoken at Cooper Union, it is surprising that he didn't make clearly known his true sentiments toward organized religion and its humanitarian work.

This does not mean, certainly, that White had no appreciation for audience adaptation in order to effect change of listener opinion. He clearly stated, for instance, that Protestant leaders were no less severe than Roman Catholic churchmen in their denunciation of scientific doctrines. None other than Martin Luther, he reminded his listeners, had called Copernicus "an upstart astrologer" who wished "to reverse the entire science of astronomy but sacred Scripture tells us that Joshua commanded the sun to stand still and not the earth."[54] Here was an attempt to avoid alienating listeners by criticizing only the leaders of one faith. A corresponding concern to provide just, unreserved compliments for the accomplishments of organized religion and unqualified statements of admiration for Christian principles was lacking. An indirect, offensive strategy seemed to White to be more satisfactory, however; a defensive posture had not mitigated the hostility of the sectarians.

In any overall assessment of White's

[51] *Ibid.*, p. 42. In his "Battlefields" speech, White referred to his discussion of the clash between religion and science as being "instructive."

[52] *Ibid.*, pp. 80-82.

[53] By 1874, White had arrived at this conclusion: "The main provision for advanced education in the United States must be made by the people at large acting through their legislatures to endow and maintain institutions for the higher instruction, fully equipped and free from sectarian control" (White, "The Relation of National and State Governments to Advanced Education," *Journal of Social Sciences*, VII [1874], 302).

[54] *Buffalo Express*, December 6, 1870.

speaking on this issue, it must be remembered that the spirit of the exploding industrial movement was working against those who tried to crush the unsectarian sentiment. Many things indicated that the breaking of old chains was bound to happen; the control of society was shifting from church to business, and this change was making itself felt. Be that as it may, in providing the vocalization of ideals when it was needed, White supplied the arrow with its flint. As one writer has said, referring to White's campaign to turn the tide against the sectarian college system, "More than any other man he was responsible for breaking the grip these schools had held for more than two hundred years on American higher education."[55]

In building his case against sectarian dominance in higher education, he made it mandatory for his opponents to reply; as he waged his campaign of offense, they were compelled, more than ever, to present a sound, attractive defense for a system becoming discordant with the mood of the country. The crucial question in the dispute became clearer: In the light of history and the promise of the present, should theological or secular forces be the principal planners of higher education, thereby shaping to no small degree the destiny of a nation?

As spokesman for the free university, then, White's most significant contribution to his cause was placing the debate in better perspective. In making this vital question paramount, he scored a strategical victory. He declared that on this question the sectarians had to make their stand; it was here they stood and lost.

Is it reasonable, therefore, to hold that White overestimated the strength of the sectarian forces, whose power at the time was beginning to wane? Can we confidently assume that his hatred for religious intolerance caused him to react to the unreasonableness of the denominational onslaughts rather than to their real significance?[56]

Whatever the answers to these questions, there is another question of greater moment. Was it not important to the progress of American scholarship for a leading educator of the times to make it known that it was on the issue of sectarian control, sidestepped by his colleagues, that he would speak out? In order for ideas to move effectively through a people, they must be forcefully energized, and there is good reason to believe that Andrew D. White, classified as a "liberal" by his contemporaries[57] and as a "religious conservative" by today's historians,[58] gave real impetus to this needed reform through his speaking.

[55] Peterson, p. 306.

[56] Rogers, pp. 82-83.

[57] New York *World*, December 18, 1869.

[58] George P. Schmidt, *The Liberal Arts College* (New Brunswick, 1957), p. 169.

CHARLES DICKENS AT THE ENGLISH CHARITY DINNER

Melvin H. Miller

THE most neglected of the many lives of Charles Dickens is his career as an after-dinner speaker. Until recently, only sporadic comments in scattered sources served to remind us that Dickens was considered by a number of his contemporaries to be the best after-dinner speaker in England.

Such comments ranged over a quarter-century. As early as 1842, Fitz-Greene Halleck wrote: "I wish you could have listened to his eloquence at the dinner here. It was the only real specimen of eloquence I have ever witnessed. Its charm was not in the words, but in the manner of saying them."[1] A dozen years later George Hodder, who had worked for Dickens as a reporter on the *Daily News*, called him, "the best after dinner speaker now alive."[2] In 1870, the eulogy which appeared in the *Times* after the death of Dickens reported: "It was but the other day at the Royal Academy Banquet he made the best speech of the evening, in matter, language and manner."[3]

Although Dickens appeared before an astonishing variety of organizations, he was at his best at that peculiarly English institution known as the public or charity dinner. Such dinners were used to raise money by subscription lists which were pledged on the spot. Tickets usually sold for a guinea, and men prominent in public life were expected to contribute their services as speakers. The pattern, consisting of loyal and patriotic toasts, an indifferent dinner, a well-known speaker, and the pledging of a subscription list never varied. The *Times* in 1853 said candidly: "Public dinners are public bores. What man of substance is there—or still worse, what man suspected of substance—who is not pestered at the least two or three times in every year to give himself a public indigestion in the cause of charity?"[4]

Boring or not, the public dinner was an accepted part of Victorian life and often raised surprisingly large amounts for various private charities. Early in his career, Dickens satirized public dinners in one of his *Sketches by Boz*, and once wrote to Thomas Noon Talford, "I swear I will shun them like a pestilence."[5] Yet in the course of his speaking career, Dickens spoke at about fifty such occasions; nearly half of the total number of speeches which he delivered were at these dinners.[6]

Since the charity dinner was so stereotyped in format and in practice, to visit one such dinner is to visit a number of

Mr. Miller is Assistant Professor of Speech, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.

[1] Reported in John Forster, *The Life of Charles Dickens*, ed. B. W. Matz (New York, 1911), II, 419-420, n. 1.

[2] George Hodder, *Memories of My Time* (London, 1870), p. 257.

[3] Editorial, *Times* (London), June 10, 1870.

[4] *Times* (London), April 14, 1853, p. 5.

[5] May 20, 1843; *Nonesuch Letters of Charles Dickens*, ed. Walter Dexter (Bloomsbury, 1938), I, 517.

[6] All of the known texts may be found in *The Speeches of Charles Dickens*, ed. K. J. Fielding (Oxford, 1960). This is the definitive work on texts of Dickens' speeches. It is arranged chronologically. See also my "Collected Speeches of Charles Dickens with Introduction and Notes" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Wisconsin, 1957) which is arranged topically and provides additional background for the speeches.

them. The purpose of the speeches never varied; it was always to raise as large a subscription list as possible. The speeches were basically persuasive, designed to move audiences to a very specific action. The chairman was the most prominent man the group could obtain. Lords and royalty stood first in desirability, although prime ministers and public figures such as Dickens rated a close second. Other prominent leaders were invited to give toasts—and contributions. All, of course, donated their services. There was a great deal of bad speaking. One writer, musing over the newly-formed military Volunteers, wryly suggested that having another toast, "The Volunteers," added to the list at a public dinner, might, perhaps, be too high a price to pay for the added national security.[7]

Into this glum setting, Dickens brought not only the basic qualification of prominence, but a reputation for effective speaking which made him much sought after by the proliferation of private charity groups existing in London. If we are to judge by such a crass standard as the amount of money pledged at such dinners, Dickens was one of the most successful after-dinner speakers in England. At fourteen charity dinners which published their subscription lists and at which Dickens was either the main speaker or the chairman or both, the donations pledged amounted to £12,687.[8]

Characteristic of the pattern of his English charity dinner appearances was the famous speech which Dickens delivered on behalf of the Hospital for Sick Children on February 9, 1858. It was a worthy cause. The Board of Health returns in the middle of the nineteenth century showed that of every thousand deaths in London, four hundred were of children under four years of age. A large percentage of these were children of the poor, who were, as Charles Lamb put it, "dragged up rather than brought up."[9]

One of the plans designed to lower this terrible rate was the conversion, in 1852, of an old mansion in Great Ormond Street, London, into a small hospital for children. Lack of funds prevented much growth and for several years its size remained at about thirty beds.[10] In 1858, the directors conceived the idea of a charity dinner and asked Charles Dickens to preside and to deliver the main address.

It was a fateful choice. Dickens threw his restless energies into the project and the result was one of his greatest speeches. "I never heard him," wrote Thomas Reed, the reporter, "or reported him, with so much pleasure. . . . His speech was magnificent, thoroughly characteristic, and extremely telling."[11] His biographer, Forster, wrote: "The

[7] "On the Art of Dinner-Giving," *Cornhill Magazine*, XIX (March 1869), 562-567.

[8] Subscription lists of organizations which kept minutes of the amounts pledged from year to year at their annual dinners make interesting reading. In 1864, for example, when Dickens addressed the Printers' Pension Society, pledges amounted to £543. The next year, when Gladstone was the speaker, the total pledged amounted to £530. HRH the Duke of Cambridge, however, raised £636 in 1858. By way of comparison, in 1934, Lord Southwood, with Winston Churchill and David Lloyd George as guests of honor, raised the enormous sum of £102,879. See *The Printers' Devil*, ed. Walter Hutchinson (London, 1943), pp. 1-10.

[9] John Forster, *The Life of Charles Dickens*, ed. J. W. T. Ley (London, 1928), p. 643.

[10] Small as it was, it must have been a busy place. The *Times* (London) of February 11, 1858, p. 7, reported that since it opened in 1852, 47,000 out-patients and 1860 in-patients had been admitted and treated, all of them children under twelve years.

[11] Reed was the reporter assigned by the hospital to report the speech. Dickens corrected the text sent to him by the secretary of the hospital and it was then published in a pamphlet entitled, *Speech of Charles Dickens, Esq., As Chairman at the Dinner on behalf of the Hospital for Sick Children, February 9, 1858*, from which the text which appears in Fielding, *Speeches*, pp. 246-253, is taken. I am indebted

whole speech, indeed, is the best of the kind spoken by him."[12]

The dinner was held in the Freemasons' Hall, one of three or four such halls which served as meeting places for nearly all of the charity dinners.[13] As with all such affairs, this was a masculine gathering with about 160 gentlemen sitting down to dinner. There were, however, a large number of ladies seated in the gallery reserved for them. Although wine was served, there was no smoking. It was not until the end of the century that smoking became acceptable, a custom, according to Charles Dickens, Jr., introduced at the public dinner by the Prince of Wales.[14]

Dickens, in 1836, described a similar setting at a dinner of the "Indigent Orphans Friends Benevolent Institution":

> Waiters, with wine baskets in their hands, are placing decanters of sherry down the tables at very respectable distances; melancholy looking salt-cellars, and decayed vinegar-cruets; which might have belonged to the parents of the Indigent Orphans in their time, are scattered at distant intervals on the cloth; and the knives and forks look as if they had done duty at every public dinner in London since the accession of George the First.[15]

The famous author who stood before them on that February night was a lithe, energetic man of medium stature with a brown mustache and a fringe of brown beard. A reporter of the period wrote that Dickens' once extravagant brown locks were thinner now and that he looked older than some of his early portraits often published with his first works.[16] His blue eyes were exceptionally bright and active. Chesterton once described them as "darting about like brilliant birds to pick up all the tiny things."[17]

Although always a little self-conscious, Dickens was in his element. He was, in the first place, sincerely devoted to charitable causes. Furthermore, he had long since discovered that he enjoyed an unusual rapport with his audiences made even more striking by the rather dreary setting of the charity dinner, a rapport which was to influence his decision to read publicly for fees.[18] Finally, his theme was much to his liking for he was devoted both to children and to the imaginative literature of childhood—themes that were reflected over and over again in his speaking.

Dickens presided and the usual toasts were given to Her Majesty the Queen, to Prince Albert and the rest of the

to Fielding who discovered that the original shorthand notes were printed in the *Phonographic Reporter*, under Reed's editorship, in 1858, pp. 38-46. Fielding had the notes transcribed and compared the transcription with the corrected proofs approved by Dickens. He found the corrections carefully done but minor (*Speeches*, p. 435). Dickens wrote W. C. Macready on March 15, 1858: "I hope you have read the little speech in the hospital's publication of it. They have had it taken by their own shorthand writer, and it is done verbatim" (*Nonesuch Letters*, III, 11). Most of Dickens' other speeches present greater problems in determining texts.

[12] "There was a simple pathos in his address from the chair quite startling in its effect at such a meeting; and he probably never moved any audience so much as by the strong personal feeling with which he referred to the sacrifices made for the hospital by the very poor themselves" (Forster, ed. Ley, p. 643).

[13] The others included Willis's Rooms (a portion of the otherwise exclusive Almack's), the Albion in Aldersgate Street, and the London Tavern in Bishopsgate. One writer complained that "you may dine at this house tonight and somewhere else tomorrow and eat almost the same dinner in each." See "The Public Dinner," *Dublin University Magazine*, XCIV (July 1879), 94.

[14] Charles Dickens, Jr., "Public Dinners in London," *North American Review*, CLIX (November 1894), 601-610.

[15] "Public Dinners," *Sketches by Boz* (London, 1836).

[16] Fielding, *Speeches*, p. 245.

[17] G. K. Chesterton, *Charles Dickens, The Last of the Great Men* (New York, 1942), p. 152.

[18] Encouraged by his success in reading to private groups, he had volunteered to read *A Christmas Carol* to supplement the funds pledged at the hospital dinner. He read with great success on April 15, 1858, and a fortnight later embarked on his new career as a public reader at St. Martin's Hall.

royal family and to the Army and the Navy. Then Dickens rose to give the "toast of the evening."

He began his speech with that remarkable poise which distinguished him from many of his contemporaries on the public platform. There is no reference in any of the material on the speeches, or in any of his letters or in the remarks of his contemporaries, that he ever hesitated, even momentarily, on the platform because of the lack of a word or the slipping away of idea. This poise enabled Dickens to establish his remarkable rapport with his audience. He was always concerned, for example, with the question of audibility, just as he was quick to capitalize on the situation of the moment. In this case, Dickens noticed empty chairs at the back of the room and tied in that observation with his thesis of the need for the growth of the nascent children's hospital. Said he:

> I have observed since we sat down here that we are quite in a childlike state altogether, representing an infant institution, and not even yet a grown-up company. A few years are necessary to the increase of our strength and the expansion of our figure; and then these tables; which now have a few tucks in them, will be let out, and then this hall, which sits so easily upon us, will be too tight and small for us.

Dickens then continued his introduction with a subject which would provide common ground then or now: "I do not mean of our own spoilt children, because nobody's own children were ever spoilt but I mean the disagreeable children of our particular friends."

A perspicacious listener to the speech could not help but realize, if he did not already know, that Dickens was not only well read, but that he was using this knowledge both directly and creatively in the speech. He would recognize, of course, that Dickens was quoting the hospital reports and the reports of the medical profession directly and that he was giving both testimony and statistical proof. He might not recognize a passage from Corinthians, however, as Dickens transposes it to suit his own purposes in describing the children brought in after dinner to meet the guests: "We know by experience what it is to have them down after dinner, and across the rich perspective of a miscellaneous dessert, to see, as in a black dose darkly, the family doctor looming in the distance."

In the conclusion of the speech, when Dickens quotes Charles Lamb, a listener might not recognize the essay quoted as being from *Essays of Elia,* but he would certainly recognize both the beauty of Lamb's language and Dickens' skill in adapting the material to the situation. He would hear Dickens recreate the picture of Lamb dreaming by his fireside on a winter's night, telling stories to his children, only to wake and find that they were but dream-children who might have been but never were. He would hear Dickens quoting the dream-children directly: " 'We are nothing,' they say to him, 'less than nothing, and dreams. We are only what might have been, and we must wait upon the tedious shores of Lethe, millions of ages, before we have existence and a name.' "

He would hear Dickens draw a swift parallel with the Children's Hospital:

> The dream-children whom I would now raise, if I could, before every one of you, according to your various circumstances, should be the dear child you love, the dearer child you have lost, the child you might have had, the child you certainly have been. Each of these dream-children should hold in its powerful hand one of the little children now lying in the Child's Hospital or now shut out of it to perish.

Dickens used his inventive powers as he described his own experiences in a tour once taken in the slums of Edinburgh. He devoted almost one-sixth of his speech to a vivid recreation of the

finding of a feeble, wasted child in an egg-box. Despite the often heard claims that Dickens was an apostle of sentiment, the speeches depend more on swiftly drawn vivid description which leads to a point he is making than on emotion for its own sake. Such descriptions are, in general, used sparingly. This one is longer and more emotional than most as Dickens wonders aloud about the child, "how he came to be left there, a little decrepit old man, pining to death, quite a thing of course, as if there were no crowds of healthy and happy children playing on the grass under the summer's sun within a stone's throw of him."

There was clarity of organization in Dickens' speeches and he was constantly concerned in adapting to his audience. This speech, developed inductively, is typical. The introduction is rather long and consists of a series of examples and comparisons, delivered with humor and directed, both in style and manner, to the audience. "We know what it is when those children won't go to bed," he confides, "we know how they prop their eyelids open with their forefingers when they will sit up; how, when they become fractious, they say aloud that they don't like us, and our nose is too long, and why don't we go."

In the body of the speech the mood changes quickly and Dickens personifies the evils of the London poor: "The two grim nurses, Poverty and Sickness, who bring these children before you, preside over their births, rock their wretched cradles, nail down their little coffins, pile up the earth above their graves. Of the annual deaths in this great town, their unnatural deaths form more than one-third." Then in the balanced style of which he is so fond, Dickens asks his listeners to turn their thoughts to the virtues of Pity and Compassion.

Having established this balance of good and evil, Dickens relates the good in practice as he describes the hospital and the work it is doing. He caps this visualization of the good at work by pointing out how the very poor themselves had contributed their pennies to a total of fifty pounds during the last year. He has established his point. His thesis is quickly stated: "This is the simple case. This is the pathetic case which I have put to you." His conclusion is the comparison of the dream-children of Lamb's essay with the children of the hospital, and the speech is over. The whole speech, only about 2200 words, took less than a half hour. This is a remarkable economy of words in such an expansive age but it is typical of Dickens' charity dinner speeches.

Although the speech was typical enough, the results were unusual. The list of subscriptions pledged at the end of the evening amounted to the astonishing sum of three thousand pounds, including nine hundred pounds from the ladies' gallery and a single pledge of five hundred pounds from an anonymous donor known only as "Mary Jane."[19] The speech was printed by the hospital a week after it was given; reprinted in 1864, and again in 1874. Sale of these publications brought "many handsome contributions" to the hospital fund.[20]

It is not often that a speech is remembered for a hundred years, but this one was. In 1952, when the Hospital for Sick Children celebrated its centenary, the directors asked that the speech be given again, and this was done. Emlyn Williams delivered it over the British Broadcasting Corporation network.[21]

For a number of reasons, then, Dick-

[19] *Times* (London), February 11, 1858, p. 7.
[20] Frederic G. Kitton, *Charles Dickens* (New York, 1908), p. 431.
[21] *Dickensian*, XLIX (December 1952), 4.

ens was well fitted to his role as a charity dinner speaker. His speaking reveals his fertile imagination, and the easy use of his own reading and experiences. Within the confines of the charity dinner, these powers were particularly appropriate. In the soporific atmosphere brought on by a long dinner, bumpers of wine and a number of stock toasts, the ability to maintain a simple plan of organization and to adapt constantly to one's audience were qualities unusual and refreshing. Since the Victorian dinner-goer went to the charity dinner more from a sense of duty than for any other reason, some of Dickens' fund raising success came, no doubt, from grateful patrons who found they were enjoying rather than enduring the proceedings. Dickens could express with energy and brilliance the things that were close to the common mind, an ability that has made him one of the most quoted writers in the language.[22] Finally, he spoke briefly and to the point. In his conclusion he calls this a "rather long speech," and it was for him. Other charity dinner speakers were not always so economical with their words or their listeners' time.

Less discernable, perhaps, was why he spoke. He was already a writer, an actor, a publisher, a traveler, and an amateur reader, and he carried on all these activities at a furious pace. Why, then, did he also appear on the platform at the charity dinner? Dickens was interested, of course, in bettering the appalling social conditions in mid-Victorian England. In this he was selective, being primarily interested in those charities which bettered the lot of the artist, and was generous in both time and money with such groups. Over a quarter of a century he spoke fourteen times at charity dinners given by the General Theatrical Fund, a group dedicated to raising money for needy or aging actors.

Part of this dedication came from his intense interest in raising the position of the literary man in England. As his American speeches on copyright and his speeches before the Literary Fund show, he was always on the defensive when it came to the role of the novelist in English life.[23] In these charity dinner situations, he could appear in the same role as royalty, great political leaders, and other leading figures, and he could support those causes he believed in, on equal terms with any man in England.

His marital troubles were still another factor. Life at Tavistock House was becoming unbearable and he seemed glad to escape to the essentially masculine society of the charity dinner. It was this year of 1858, with his marriage strained to the breaking point, that he gave more speeches than in any other year of his life.[24]

Certainly he found the close kinship with his audience stimulating. In public speaking he could find a rapport not possible with either his writing or his acting. One cannot help but notice that his career as a professional reader came in the last dozen years of his life after he had discovered there was a way in which he could combine his writing, his acting, and his speaking to give him the recognition he constantly craved and which was financially profitable.

[22] *The Oxford Dictionary of Quotations* (London, 1953) lists Dickens among the half-dozen most quoted writers in the language.

[23] For an account of his stormy relations with the Literary Fund see K. J. Fielding, "Charles Dickens and the Royal Literary Fund: 1855," *Times Literary Supplement*, Part I (October 15, 1954), 664. See also Part II (October 22, 1954), 680; and the *Review of English Studies*, VI (October 1955), 386-394.

[24] He gave fourteen speeches this year. These included not only charity dinner speeches but dinners in his honor and speeches prefacing his professional readings.

None of these reasons would have been meaningful if Dickens had found the speaking situation, as Thackeray did, a difficult and sometimes terrifying one. If he did find any difficulty in either the composition or the delivery of a speech, he never mentioned it to anyone. Indeed his contemporaries looked upon his ability in awe. George Dolby, Dickens' manager on the American reading tour, described a conversation which he and Wilkie Collins had with Dickens on the subject of speechmaking. Dickens claimed the art of speechmaking was one of the easiest and simplest things in the world. "The only difficulty that existed," said Dickens, "was in introducing the subject to be dealt with." Dickens then went on to say that he would take a long walk and decide on the various heads to be dealt with. These being arranged in their proper order, he would in his "mind's eye" liken the whole subject to the tire of a cart wheel—he being the hub. He would then insert as many spokes as there were subjects to be treated and then discard them one by one as he delivered the speech. Dolby claimed that he had often observed Dickens "dismissing the spokes from his mind by a quick action of the finger as if he were knocking them away."[25]

Dickens spoke, then, because of dedication to the causes he supported, because of his constant need to justify the role of the writer, and in particular, himself. As his private life became more unhappy, Dickens found refuge in the activity of public life. Finally, although there is no evidence to suggest that he ever had any formal training for speaking, he found the speaking situation stimulating and not particularly difficult.

In the final analysis, he was the best example of his own advice which he once gave to a friend who had been, as he termed it, "forced into the innings" as the chairman of a charity dinner: "There is no doubt that it is of immense importance to a public man in our way to have his wits at his tongue's end."[26] Dickens did, indeed, have his "wits at his tongue's end," and twenty-five years of charity dinners were the better for it.

[25] George Dolby, *Charles Dickens as I Knew Him* (London, 1887), pp. 273-275.

[26] To Wilkie Collins, May 24, 1861; *Nonesuch Letters*, III, 221.

SPEECH IN THE EXISTENTIAL SITUATION

Henry Nelson Wieman

THE problem to be considered in this essay can be stated in these words: How can the resources of the existential situation be used to communicate awareness of the good and evil in the alternative courses of action calling for decision? I shall try to show that this problem is of paramount importance for the conduct of human living generally and especially for the time in which we live.

The existential situation is the actual, present set of conditions in which the speaker utters what he has to say. It is made up of three parts: (1) the total expressiveness of the bodily presence and personality of the speaker; (2) the total responsiveness of the bodily presence and personality of the listener or listeners; (3) the events leading to the present from which arise the alternative courses of action determining the good and evil in the lives of those involved.

The kind of speech which communicates the sense of good and evil most effectively is here called "creative interchange" to distinguish it from other forms of speech. By creative interchange we mean that kind of communication which does three things: (1) creates an understanding in the listener of the viewpoint of the speaker; (2) integrates this viewpoint into the perspective of the listener so that he has a more comprehensive understanding; (3) communicates the sense of good and evil so that each can be aware of the way the other values the alternative possibilities arising out of the situation.

The viewpoint and the values thus communicated may be in error. Nevertheless this kind of communication is of great positive value because knowledge of misdirected striving in the lives of associates is indispensable to any effective, intelligent action. The discovery of error, and the effort to correct it, is one of the most common ways leading to more comprehensive and reliable knowledge. Furthermore, it may be I who have the error and I who judge the evil to be good. In this case, interchange of the sense of good and evil between me and the other person is the way in which my mistaken standard of judgment is most likely to be corrected. Regardless of the truth and error involved, and regardless of the mistaken sense of good and evil communicated, this kind of interchange is a basic good in human life. It is the chief way in which error is corrected, knowledge expanded, values purged, insight deepened, and appreciative understanding established among individuals, groups, and peoples. Creative interchange cannot be complete until the viewpoint of the other is integrated into my own perspective. This integration may be positive, affirming the truth and virtue involved in the communication, or it may be negative. In either case this integration expands and deepens the sense of values and the knowledge had by each.

All thought, all striving, all knowl-

Mr. Wieman is Professor Emeritus of Philosophy and Religion, University of Chicago, and Professor of Philosophy, Southern Illinois University. He is author of The Wrestle of Religion with Truth *(1927),* The Source of Human Good *(1946),* The Directive in History *(1949), and* Man's Ultimate Commitment *(1958). With Otis M. Walter he wrote "Toward an Analysis of Ethics for Rhetoric,"* QJS, *October 1957.*

edge, all action, all decision, indeed the whole of human life is directed and controlled by what men judge to be good and evil. Therefore, the all-important part of any communication is the view of good and evil involved in it. Logic, information, evidence, knowledge, and rationality take on great value when they serve to communicate a profound sense of good and evil and clarify the distinctions between them. But when information, technique, and rational order are not put to communicating this profound intuition, or when they are treated as ends in themselves, they become trivial in the sense that they make no appreciable difference in the conduct of human living. Nothing can make an appreciable difference in human life unless it motivates thought, feeling, and action. Since the sense of good and evil alone can motivate, all knowledge and all forms of reason are trivial unless they carry with them this driving sense.

But values cannot be communicated effectively and profoundly apart from the resources of the existential situation. In order to communicate effectively the sense of good and evil, the total expressiveness of the bodily presence and personality of the speaker is required; also required is the total responsiveness of the bodily presence and personality of the listener. This expressiveness and responsiveness must be joined with awareness of the events leading to the present and must reveal the fateful alternative possibilities issuing from these events.

This points to a very important conclusion about a dominant drift in modern society. Communication is being taken over more and more by machinery, which excludes the expressiveness of the bodily presence and personality of the speaker and reduces the responsiveness of the listener. These mechanized forms of communication include print, radio, television, recorded speeches, and teaching machines. Such mechanized communication reduces the sense of events that created the present and reduces the possibility of realizing the fateful consequences of the future.

Television does, of course, present the visual image of the speaker, but this is not the same as the bodily presence. Television productions are generally show pieces, artfully designed and lacking the spontaneity of bodily presence. Even when not artfully designed, the individual in the wholeness of his being, charged with his compelling sense of values, is not before us. As for the listener, sitting alone or with a few friends in his home amid conditions designed for relaxation rather than total responsiveness, watching a production interspersed with commercial advertisements and trivial skits, he is in no condition to respond to the values involved in compelling and fateful issues. The existential situation necessary to communicate a driving sense of good and evil is even more clearly absent in other mechanized forms of communication so that radio has fewer aspects of the existential situation, while printing, recordings, teaching machines, all fail to create the best conditions for creative interchange.

A serious danger threatens our society as mechanized communication prevails and the speech of creative interchange declines. The danger is that men will lose the sense of the great values at stake in human existence, thus becoming apathetic, preoccupied with trivial matters, unable to experience the driving passion of those men who have lived greatly, whether in defeat or in triumph. This apathy and triviality will be the consequence of excluding speech in the form of creative interchange, because the great values must

be built up in the individual by this kind of communication. No infant is born with these values; he must acquire them by integrating many visions into a profound and comprehensive vision.

By no means are we saying that speech with bodily presence in the existential situation always communicates the sense of good and evil among the parties concerned. There are many kinds and forms of speech. In many cases, speech communicates values no better than a machine does. But creative interchange, which requires the existential situation as we have defined it, does communicate values more profoundly and effectively than any other form of speech. The great art in speech is to communicate values at deeper levels than is possible without this art. Values at deeper levels are those that underlie and sustain a great number of other values. Words alone are ineffective in communicating values, but speech in the threefold existential situation may bring the maximum sense of awareness of the good and evil implicit in alternative choices. In such a situation, creative interchange would be lifted to dominance over counter processes.

On the other hand, it should be noted that creative interchange is not an ideal. It is an actuality that is always occurring to some degree, even when suppressed, obstructed, and reduced to a minimum by other kinds of communication and by distracting interests. Although creative interchange is not an ideal, one may have ideals about it, just as one may have the ideal of lifting it to a higher level of dominance. The process of creative interchange is prior to all ideals. One must first have the sense of good and evil before he can have ideals. Since creative interchange creates the sense of good and evil at the human level, it is the creative source of all ideals. Therefore, instead of ideals bringing creative interchange into existence, the reverse is the truth of the matter. Moreover, if ideals are to have their scope extended or if one is to be moved by values at deeper levels, creative interchange must first awaken the ideal or value. In the development of both human individuals and human cultures, creative interchange advances the ideal rather than the ideal advancing creative interchange.

For these reasons, ideals should be subordinated to creative interchange and made to serve it. When the reverse occurs, great evils follow. When the ideal is set up as supreme and human life is shaped to meet the demands of the ideal, this sovereignty suppresses and inhibits the creativity which should correct the ideal and expand its range of values. In addition, the sovereignty of the ideal prevents such correction as might occur if the ideal were forced to meet the demands of different individuals, problems, and conditions. When the ideal is supreme, it cannot be transformed to take into consideration those deeper values and wider reaches of good and evil which can be brought about through creative interchange.

In failing to understand the necessity to make creative interchange superior to ideals, many have made tragic errors. The religious humanist sets up the ideal as supreme. The tragic error of the social sciences is that they repudiate the moral obligation of seeking out the social conditions most favorable for the effective operation of creative interchange among individuals, among organized groups, and among all conflicting divisions of society, including the diverse nations, cultures, and races now compelled to live on this planet in intimate interdependence. This moral irresponsibility of the social sciences is one of the most dangerous features of

our American society. The social scientists claim that their responsibility ends with providing the knowledge that can be used as a means to the attainment of any end, no matter how evil that end may be. Thus the exploiters, the deceivers, the propagandists, the racketeers, and the destroyers are served as readily and effectively by research in the social sciences as any who might seek to promote the greater good. This moral irresponsibility may not characterize all social scientists, but it is the position taken by the sociologists with whom I have conversed and argued.

Speech, both as a field for research and as a practicing art, carries a special moral responsibility for promoting the kind of communication which expands the range of what men can appreciate as good and distinguish as evil. If creative interchange is not the best name to distinguish this kind of speech, some other name can be devised. The name is not important, but this kind of communication is, since all distinctively human values are created by creative interchange, beginning with early infancy and continuing throughout the life of the individual. If creative interchange does not occur effectively between parent and child, the child becomes neurotic or psychotic or otherwise unfit to live with other human beings in ways of mutual trust and mutual support.

To the measure that this kind of communication dominates over the counter processes going on in our interpersonal and social relations, life is good. To the measure that it is obstructed, reduced, or subordinated to other processes, life becomes evil. This claim is based first of all on the fact that this kind of interchange creates the human level of existence in the infant. To the measure that it prevails over counter processes, it sustains the human level over against all that tends to tear down and destroy mutual support and creative transformation in our relations to one another. This kind of interchange renders conflict constructive rather than destructive since it expands the range of our sense of values to include those of the other party. It is the only way that conflicts can be resolved insofar as resolution is possible. When conflicts cannot be resolved, this kind of interchange makes the conflict a source of new insights and constructive action, provided that the conflicting parties give priority to this kind of interchange as being the source of greatest good.

This is not a blueprint for utopia. No suggestion is here made that all evil will disappear and all good prevail if and when the moral priority of creative interchange is accepted and is promoted by research in the social sciences and in the art of communication. Our only claim is that this is the way, and the only way, in which human life can be made less evil. No one knows how much good may be attained, and how much evil may be reduced or how much the reverse may occur. But there is a way to promote the good so far as it can be promoted. If we fail and life sinks to even deeper levels of evil, the claim still stands: Creative interchange is the way to promote the greater good in so far as it is possible to promote it. To what degree it can prevail, nobody knows. But this is the road to the greater good, whether or not we are able to travel it.

More than any other animal, man is addicted to courses of action leading to self-destruction. Other animals may fail to cope with environmental conditions, but they do not develop ever-increasing power organized and directed to their own destruction. Men have been occupied in such destruction throughout

human history, whether they did it by exploiting and grinding down to miserable poverty the mass of workers or by wanton destruction and exhaustion of natural resources or by military conquest and slaughter of fellow men.

The chief danger that has always threatened human existence, becoming more dangerous as human power increases, is this propensity for self-destruction. The only way of deliverance from the fatal consequences of this propensity is the kind of communication by which we get the values of the other person, group, or class of people, and integrate them into our own perspective. This is the thesis I shall try to demonstrate, first by stating the distinctive characteristics of the human level of existence and then showing that creative interchange creates this human level, sustains it, saves it from self-destruction, and develops its constructive potentialities to the measure that it prevails over all that oppose it.

Excepting the biological organism of man, everything distinctively human is created and sustained by the use of language. The human level is distinguished from every other form of existence by the indefinite expansion of the range of knowledge, of control, of values appreciated and evils distinguished, and by the depth of subjectivity which the individual finds in himself and senses in other human beings. But all this is the consequence of using language when language means signs which carry meanings sufficiently independent of the local situation to expand and develop in the ways just mentioned. Even the biological organism peculiar to man, while not directly created by language, could not occur without it. The new born human infant is so helpless for so long a time that it could not be kept alive and developed to become a language-user without the elaborate, intimate, and long continued care made possible by the use of language between the parents and other associates upon whom the infant depends for survival.

Culture and history are distinctive characteristics of the human level of existence, but they could not arise nor continue without the use of language. Culture is the sharing of knowledge, techniques, and values; and this sharing could not occur without the kind of communication made possible by the use of language. History is the accumulation and communication of resources for human living through a sequence of generations, and this also depends on the use of language. These uniquely human activities require for their origin that language, at least in some degree, be used creatively to expand the range of knowledge, the perception of values, and the awareness of deep subjectivity in one's self and others. But language can be used in other ways that prevent creative interchange.

Creative interchange should be sharply distinguished from that use of language by which one party dominates and controls the other without any consideration for the values sought and cherished by the dominated individuals. Many kinds of propaganda used to exercise political control or sell goods are of this sort. Language can be used in this way to reduce individuals to brainwashed puppets. Still another kind of communication to be distinguished from the creative is the deceptive. Language is commonly used to protect one's own self esteem by building up a false picture of the self, thus constructing an image deceiving others and also one's self. Then there is regulative communication by which activities are directed and coordinated without generating any new insights or awakening appreciative consciousness of the values cherished by the individuals involved. Traffic rules

are of this sort, as are all rules when there is no creative transformation of the mind and no expanding range of evaluation.

Of course, rules and many other kinds of communication have their place in the conduct of human society. But they stand in contrast to creative interchange when it uses all the resources of the existential situation to communicate from one to another the sense of good and evil. Religion, morality, art, love, friendship, devotion, passion, vision, and statesmanship all grow out of this kind of interchange creating progressively the range and depth of values that people can experience. Life is mean or noble, destructive or constructive, miserable or blessed, according as the value-sense of individuals is developed by this kind of communication.

The living presence of a person committed to the import of his utterance, and relatively free of inner conflicts and inhibitions, is a presence with powerful "hidden persuaders." The impassioned and dedicated person has hidden persuaders in the sense that a great part of his expressiveness reaches us persuasively below the level of consciousness. We become aware of his thought, his mind, his purpose, of the kind of person he is, in ways we cannot analyze. We say it is intuitive. The human mind is always fallible, and these intuitions may be in error, but it is amazing how accurate and right they are in many cases. Small children especially, with very undeveloped intellectuality and very little self-consciousness, have these correct intuitions arising from unconscious response to the subtle and complex expressiveness of another person.

Members of the family in intimate association are frequently communicating with one another below the level of consciousness. The communication is expressed in their reciprocal behavior toward one another. Words are used, but the meaning conveyed by these words is not at all derived from the verbal context. It is derived from the existential situation, including the unconscious expressiveness and the unconscious interpretation of this expressiveness on the part of the persons in the situation.

The most profound and important evaluative understanding of other persons comes to us in this way from unconscious resources in the existential situation. At this unconscious or semiconscious level, a speaker communicates with the listener and responds to him when conditions are favorable and when speech utilizes the resources of the existential situation. What we get from the other person in this way is not a descriptive statement about him, for such statements fall hopelessly short of conveying this "understanding" of him. This understanding is our ability to respond appropriately to his unique individuality and to his intentions, purposes, and passions. Our response may be negative in opposition, or positive in cooperation, but it is profound beyond the reach of descriptive statements.

In all these cases the existential situation is potent over the verbal context in determining the meaning communicated. Sometimes the existential situation submerges the verbal context to such a degree that the words take on a meaning wholly foreign to the "proper" or dictionary meaning, as in the following story from *A Tree Grows in Brooklyn*.

It was the night before Christmas, and the family was too poor to buy a Christmas tree. But the little girl of ten and her brother, nine years of age, knew of a custom prevailing in the locality. They knew that late on the night before Christmas the men who

sold Christmas trees would give a tree to any person who would stand up and have a tree thrown at him and not fall down when hit. So brother and sister went out that night to the yard around the corner where the man was selling trees and asked him to throw a tree at them. They stood up hand in hand to support one another while the man threw a tree. They did not fall and so claimed the tree. Then the man said to them: "And now get the hell out of here with your tree, you lousy bastards."

Such were the words the man used. But children have the strange capacity to get a meaning different from the words, a meaning derived from the person and the situation. So the little girl understood that when the man said, "Get the hell out of here," in a certain tone of voice on Christmas Eve when hearts are tender and when the rough men in the locality had no other language, what he really meant was, "Goodbye—God bless you." But the man could not use such language, and the little girl knew it. He used the only kind of language he knew how to use, and the little girl understood the meaning derived not from the words but from the social-historical situation called Christmas time combined with expressiveness of personality.

The written word and mechanized communication have their own kind of superiority over the spoken. When the meaning is derived from the verbal context to the exclusion of the existential situation, the statement can retain its identity of meaning when time passes and new situations arise. The existential situation, giving power and depth and scope of meaning to the spoken word, is swiftly transitory. Hence, the meaning derived from it cannot be recovered except as the original situation, or a typical situation of the same kind, is imaginatively reproduced. But such reproduction is only a pale reflection of what actually happened where the existential situation was most potent in giving depth of meaning to what was said.

The written word does not exclude entirely the meanings derived from the existential situation. For example, a pamphlet or essay written to promote a cause in the heat and turmoil of a great social struggle can take on much of its meaning from the existential situation. But it can never do this with the sweeping power of the spoken word rightly uttered at such a time. Literature as a fine art can also quicken the imagination so that an existential situation is imagined. But here again this falls far short of the actual situation in respect to its effectiveness for stirring men to action, transforming the mental attitude, and recreating organization of personality. Furthermore, this imagined situation depends for its effectiveness and content upon actual situations that have been experienced by way of the spoken word.

Complex social-historical situations cannot pour their full meaning into the life of the individual or into the life of the people without the spoken word to interpret this meaning and communicate it. The spoken word may be spoken to oneself; but without speech, the depth, the transforming power, and the far reach of values to be derived from the swiftly passing existential situation can never enter human experience and shape the conduct of human life. This is the genius and high vocation of speech in contrast to the written word and all mechanized forms of communication.

The human level of existence is created by the use of language with all the meanings that language can carry. This human level is dangerously self-

destructive. It becomes self-destructive when there is obstruction to the kind of interchange which creates appreciative understanding of one another. It is constructive when this communication of the values of each to the other can be most full, free, and profound, thus expanding indefinitely the vision of good and evil involved in the situation calling for decision and action to avoid the evil and attain the good.

We are all in the predicament of being human. He who says that the human level of existence is not good does thereby demonstrate that he has not found it good. Psychological studies indicate that he who has not found it good to live at the human level, is one who has not found among his fellows an appreciative understanding of himself nor has acquired such an understanding of them. On the other hand, he who finds human life good is one who has been able to engage in this kind of interchange with the experience of expanding horizons of good and evil through learning from others a widening range of what can be evaluated.

We live in an age when communication of values has declined giving place to mechanized communication of knowledge and techniques of control. The consequence is that knowledge and power of control have increased more rapidly than the sense of values by which this knowledge and this power might be directed and controlled. For this reason we do not know how to use our magnified power constructively and wisely. When power is swiftly and vastly increased without proportionate increase in the range and depth of values discerned and appreciated, the power becomes destructive in the hands of those who do not know how to use it for their own good. This is the predicament of modern man. His salvation lies in that kind of interchange which increases the range and depth of values discerned and appreciated.

Here is the high vocation and major responsibility for the teacher of speech. First of all it is a problem for research. Then it is the cultivation of an art. The problem and the art are to make speech expressive of values by using the resources of the existential situation. This is the kind of speech we must have to be saved from self destruction when our power has become so great that it cannot be controlled nor directed by the sense of values now prevailing. We must have a more profound, comprehensive, and accurate discernment of the good and evil involved in the social developments of our time. This must be created in the minds of men by the kind of speech which communicates from one to another the deepest discernment of value each has attained. In this way the integration of many visions into one profound and comprehensive vision might show us the way to use our power constructively. Furthermore, this is the only way that democracy can be sustained and communicated to others.

We have gathered knowledge and magnified power in many areas, but we have neglected to seek knowledge concerning the conditions under which the value-sense of the individual and the values shared in community can be deepened, widened, corrected, and made to remove the barriers of estrangement and hostility among peoples and cultures. To express these values and remove these barriers is the opportunity and responsibility for the teacher of speech.

GENERAL SEMANTICS AND ACADEMIC PHAGOCYTOSIS

John B. Newman

THERE are few things that seem to be more fun than taking pot shots at General Semantics. It is a time-honored sport, and after some twenty-five or thirty years of it, the veteran observer has probably long since been witness to every possible variety thereof. Numbers of articles on and about General Semantics have appeared over the years in the pages of *QJS* and other publications. Those articles written by proponents of General Semantics have, of course, been favorable to it. Others, carping, caviling, and critical, were written by its outspoken opponents. Still others, written by those who held themselves or their articles above such controversy, have brushed General Semantics aside, sometimes with, sometimes against the grain. But this article is one which may be somewhat different; the shots this time are going to come from *inside* the pot!

In serious preamble to what follows, however, I wish to acknowledge a great debt owed General Semantics. One of its greatest proponents, the late Professor Irving J. Lee, taught me a principle, here acknowledged to be one of the most important ever learned. That principle may be stated as follows: regardless of the subject or one's feelings for or against it, one should always remember in the course of an argument *to disagree agreeably*. I have tried to follow this principle in writing this article, and it is hoped readers will follow it too.

Mr. Newman is Associate Professor of Speech, Queens College, New York. *This essay is an adaptation of a paper presented at a General Semantics and Related Methodologies Interest Group meeting at the 1960 SAA Convention in St. Louis.*

Just exactly when the circumstance we wish now to consider began to take shape, it is difficult to say. But it seems to have reached a point where it can no longer be ignored. Here is an instance. In a recent book review, there appeared the following paragraph:

> The subject matter of this work is largely drawn from Bergmann, Hempel, Carnap, Skinner, and Quine, but the student of General Semantics will recognize a number of familiar concepts. Although not citing Korzybski as a source for their material, the authors present a table that very much resembles the structural differential. The use of dates and indexes is recommended, and the concept of time-binding is discussed, although not called by that term.

The fault in this instance is not the reviewer's. It is General Semantics that is to blame! For anyone who has studied the Korzybskian formulations—the devout delight in referring to them as a "discipline;" and because of the ambiguity of the term, "discipline" it shall remain!—anyone who has been exposed to the "discipline" of General Semantics runs the risk of seeing the world through "time-bound" glasses, each lens of which is indexed, dated, and hyphenated in quotes. In other words, General Semantics is, by its very nature and essence, cytophagous.

Such a charge should be explained. The word *cytophagous* is the adjectival form of the noun *phagocytosis*. Its constituent morphemes are simply reversed. Phagocytosis is a biological term de-

fined as the englobement and ingestion of particles foreign to it by a cell body or single-celled organism. A phagocyte is either fixed to connective tissue or else it is free—a sort of wandering cell, englobing and ingesting practically everything in its path. Phagocytosis may be thought of as a sort of combined form of cellular locomotion and ingestion. Extensions of protoplasm, called pseudopodia, are put forward from the cell body and then combine to effect the over-all movement of the entire cell body. If there happens to be a foreign particle in the way, it is englobed and ingested, becoming part of the cell body itself.

It is presently postulated that those formulations attributed to Alfred Korzybski, and widely promulgated as General Semantics, are a sort of wandering academic phagocyte, whose relationships with other academic disciplines and departments of knowledge are similar to the processes of englobement and ingestion described as phagocytosis. As General Semantics has bumped about the groves of academe, its slogan might well have been: "If you can't beat 'em, eat 'em!"

It has been said that the Holy Roman Empire was neither holy nor Roman. In like fashion, it can now be said that General Semantics is neither general nor semantics! But just as the Holy Romans built an empire, so has General Semantics!

General Semantics has been described as "a movement the purpose of which is to make every rank and file intelligent individual appreciate and use in daily life the rigorous methods of scientific thinking."[1] Even if the axiological nobility of this sentiment is granted, the vulnerability of its logic may nonetheless be tested. Can this statement of purpose be verified, invalidated, or proved to be simply tautological? If by "scientific thinking" is meant "viewpoints, habits, methods and attitudes that lead to the successful solution of problems,"[2] then General Semantics *is not general*! By its own doctrine, it would not pertain to scientists being scientific; it would not pertain to mathematicians being mathematical and to logicians being logical; it would not pertain to problem-solvers who solve problems; it would not, in fine, pertain to anyone who does not permit "signs and symbols including language" to get in the way of what he is doing! Does it, then, deserve to be called *General* Semantics?

It has been pointed out that the singular contribution of General Semantics to rhetorical theory is its insistence on the truth-to-facts of the so-called "label step."[3] It would seem, therefore, to be incumbent upon General Semantics itself to look to its own labels. If *they* are false-to-facts, the very maps of General Semantics itself would not truly represent its *own* territory!

Examine, for instance, the following statement:

> In 1931, Korzybski coined the term *General Semantics* for his studies of Time-Binding in a paper presented before the American Mathematical Society at New Orleans, Louisiana, December 28, 1931 (see "Supplement III" of *Science and Sanity*). Korzybski had previously completed the first draft of *Science and Sanity* in 1928 in which he did not use the words *semantics, general semantics* or *semantic reactions,* and had attended the Congres des mathematiciens des pays Slaves at Warsaw, Poland, in 1929. In his 1931 paper, "A Non-Aristotelian System and its Necessity for Rigour in Mathe-

[1] This definition appears on page three of the June 1960 issue of *Verbal Level,* published by the New York Society for General Semantics, where it is "attributed to Nicholas Rashevsky, 1951, by M. Gorman."

[2] *General Information Bulletin No. 6,* unpaged, undated, published by the International Society for General Semantics, Chicago, Ill.

[3] Daniel Fogarty, *Roots for a New Rhetoric* (New York, 1959). See chap. 4, esp. pp. 100-103.

matics and Physics," Korzybski presented material on *"the restricted semantics school* represented by Chwistek and his pupils . . . characterized by the semantic approach," and first used the term *General Semantics* for his non-aristotelian [*sic*!], non-elementalistic general discipline. He reported that his researches had resulted "in the discovery of a *general semantic mechanism* underlying human behavior, many new inter-relations and formulations culminating in a (non-aristotelian [*sic*!]) system." Thus the background of Korzybski's use of the term *General Semantics* is found in the work of the Polish mathematical logicians, although some writers have erroneously presented it as an outgrowth of "semantics," a branch of philology, a term often used as a popular synonym for word study, etc. However, as pointed out by Allen Walker Read, the lexicographer, in "An Account of the Word 'Semantics'" (*Word*, IV, 2, August 1948), "the great popular vogue of the word *semantics* can be traced to the ferment caused by the works of Alfred Korzybski."[4]

The choice, by a lexicographer, of the word *ferment* in the last sentence of this quotation is indeed a nice one. May it be ventured that the "ferment" was as much the result of the confusion caused by Korzybski's use of the term *semantics* in the title of his system, and of the term *general* to modify it, as it was the result of what his formulations advocated? As recently as August, 1958, Anatol Rapoport reported Korzybski as having "expressed regret for having chosen the name 'general semantics'" and that "neurolinguistics would be an appropriate name for the science of general semantics."[5]

Furthermore, it is doubtful that Korzybski coined the term *General Semantics*. General Semantics was a term used by Polish (and other) mathematical logicians to refer to an area that had not yet been fully developed in their study of the semiotic. The semiotic, or the science of signs, consists of three parts: syntactics, the study of the relation of signs to other signs; pragmatics, the study of the relation of signs to their users; and semantics, the study of the relation of signs to that which they stand for, or their designata.[6]

Investigations into the relation of signs to their designata are of two kinds: descriptive semantics and pure semantics. The analysis of the semantic feature of "some particular historically given language," such as French, would be an example of *special* or *restricted* semantics of the descriptive variety. The analysis of the semantic feature of "all historically given languages" would be an example of *general* semantics of the descriptive variety.[7] Stephen Ullmann, for example, has a chapter, in *The Principles of Semantics,* entitled "General Semantics"[8]—that is, general semantics of the descriptive variety, not General Semantics of the Korzybski variety.

There could also be set up a system of rules for the relation of signs to their designata in an artificial language such as Lobachevskian geometry, or Boolean algebra, or some such similar artificial language. This is called pure semantics in contradistinction to descriptive semantics because "it is entirely analytic and without factual content."[9] The construction of a system of rules governing the relation of signs to their designata in a given artificial language would be an example of special or restricted semantics of the pure variety,

[4] M. Kendig, "Historical: On General Semantics and Korzybski's Works," *General Semantics Bulletin,* Institute of General Semantics, Nos. 1 & 2 (Lakeville, Conn., Autumn-Winter 1949-1950), p. viii.

[5] Anatol Rapoport, "General Semantics: Its Place in Science," *ETC.: A Review of General Semantics,* XVI (1958), 85.

[6] Rudolf Carnap, *Introduction to Semantics and Formalization of Logic* (Cambridge, Mass., 1959), I, 9; Charles W. Morris, *Signs, Language and Behavior* (New York, 1946), pp. 217ff.

[7] Carnap, p. 11.

[8] Stephen Ullmann, *The Principles of Semantics,* 2nd ed. (New York, 1957), chap. 5, pp. 258-299.

[9] Carnap, p. 12.

whereas the construction of a system of rules governing the relation of signs to their designata for all artificial languages would be an example of general semantics of the pure variety.

The Polish mathematical logicians were specialists in pure semantics. They had accomplished the task of defining logical and descriptive signs with respect to any given system; hence the reference in Kendig's statement to "the restricted semantics school." But they had not yet accomplished a definition for logical and descriptive signs for systems in general, or, in other words, a general semantics of the pure variety. As a matter of fact, a satisfactory solution was not known as recently as July, 1958, according to Rudolf Carnap, a mathematical logician in his own right and a member of the original Vienna Circle.[10] This was the name Korzybski chose as the title of his system of formulations. If the background of Korzybski's use of the term *General Semantics* is to be found in the work of the Polish mathematical logicians, the usage might be considered questionable.

Even if General Semantics is granted its professed derivation, it would have been consistent for Korzybski to have made use of classifications and terminology that were already current. Carnap, who described Korzybski's formulations as "a theory concerning the use of language, and especially the causes and effects of, and cures for, certain misuses of language," pointed out that Korzybski's use of the term *semantics* "corresponds more to our 'pragmatics.' "[11]

It is secondary, however, as to whether Korzybski called his system "general semantics" or "general pragmatics." Calling it "general semantics" may simply extend the homonymy of the term *semantics* and add another subscript to its list of indexes. The primary point is that, regardless of what he called it, Korzybski formulated his system in such a way that it could englobe and ingest the entire semiotic or science of signs. What with all its talk about "maps and territories," one would get the impression that General Semantics is concerned with the relation of signs to their designata, which is, after all, the proper area of semantics. Examination will prove, however, that Korzybski's analogy of maps and territories is based more on the similarity of their structure,[12] or, again in the terminology of mathematical logicians, their "syntactics" rather than their "semantics."

Surely Korzybski knew what he was doing when he chose "General Semantics" as the name of his system, regardless of any subsequent atonement. By so doing he laid claim, by implication, to the rules governing the relation of signs to their designata for systems in general, or, to turn a phrase, the semantics of everything, his own principle of "non-allness" to the contrary notwithstanding! No wonder that Alfred Tarski, one of the Polish logicians whose work was supposed to have shaped the background of Korzybski's General Semantics, was constrained to qualify his use of the term *semantics* itself:

> It is perhaps worth while saying that semantics as it is conceived in this paper (and in former papers of the author) is a sober and modest discipline, which has no pretensions of being a universal patent-medicine for all the ills and diseases of mankind, whether imaginary or real. You will not find in semantics any remedy for decayed teeth or illusions of grandeur or class conflicts. Nor is semantics a device for establishing that everyone except

[10] *Ibid.*, pp. 56, 59.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 238.
[12] See, for instance, Alfred Korzybski, *Science and Sanity*, 2nd ed. (Lancaster, Pa., 1941), pp. 750-751, *et in passim*.

the speaker and his friends is speaking nonsense.[13]

Mr. Tarski, obviously a sensitive soul, must have at some time spoken up in what was deemed an "anti-semantic" fashion!

A set of formulations entitled, and hence promulgated by implication, as a general system of rules governing the relation of "signs and symbols including language" to their designata covers a lot of territory. It should not come as a surprise, then, that General Semantics should concern itself with just about anything that happens to come along. Anyone acquainted with the literature of General Semantics will recall the many articles on "General Semantics and This" and "General Semantics and That." Whole issues of journals are devoted to metalinguistics, information theory, transactional psychology, translation, and intercultural communication. Popular, jazz, and blues songs, Zen Buddhism, and the sexual symbolism in certain models of American automobiles also figure in the body of this literature. The diversity of this enumeration is, however, not always indicative of a catholicity of purview.

There seems, instead, to be maintained a more or less consistent pattern of evaluating what are sometimes referred to as "related methodologies" as though the particular one under consideration is, and was all along, subsumed by General Semantics. So, metalinguistics, for instance, may be explained and evaluated in terms of Korzybski's formulations in the light of its setting forth principles that are neither contrary nor contradictory to "the extensional devices," "the structural differential," "consciousness of abstraction," "non-elementalism," "non-allness," etc., etc. This can be classified as the englobement phase of what is here called academic phagocytosis.

When, however, one sees references in print to "the Sapir-Whorf-Korzybski Hypothesis," then has one been witness to the ingestion phase of the academic cytophagy of General Semantics. Here is an instance where General Semantics did not pursue its usual course of "if you can't lick 'em, join 'em," as would have been manifested in some such familiar title as "General Semantics and the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis." Here instead is a case of "eat 'em if you can't beat 'em!"

How or why Korzybski's name is linked with the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis, it is difficult to fathom—unless it is for the sake of elevation by association. If Korzybski proposed anything, he proposed a set of "safety devices" designed to correct linguistic formulations cast in what he termed an "aristotelian" or out-of-date fashion. By applying "science" to language, symbolism, and communication, Korzybski proposed to bring about "sanity" in our time. The Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis offers no "safety valves" and no "corrective devices." Both Sapir and Whorf were anthropological linguists whose formulations were strictly descriptive. They maintained, first, that human cognition is influenced by the structure of the language of the community, and, second, that the structure of the language being spoken is reflected in the speaker's thinking processes.

This is not a new concept. Its antecedents "can be traced back as far as Herder; but it is especially Humboldt who can be regarded as [its] spiritual ancestor."[14] Are we, then, to anticipate a Herder-Humboldt-Korzybski Hypothesis as well?

[13] Alfred Tarski, "The Semantic Conception of Truth," in *Semantics and the Philosophy of Language*, ed. Leonard Linsky (Urbana, Ill., 1952), p. 17.

[14] Ullmann, p. 154; also pp. 155ff, 319.

But all this is not to say that General Semantics is unworthy of serious consideration and study. Alfred Korzybski had a definite contribution to make: certainly in pragmatics, doubtlessly in semantics as it has come to be broadly conceived, perhaps also in syntactics. There should be little doubt of his achievement in certain regards. It is regrettable that his formulations were so convolved as to permit such extenuated application.

Perhaps it is time for General Semantics to climb its own ladder of abstraction! Perhaps it could then modify its own structure from that of an academically cytophagous doctrine to that of a more complex form of academic discipline whose relationships with other departments of knowledge would signify achievement of insight and growth in the understanding of those relationships rather than a quasi-pseudopodial englobement and ingestion.

LISTENER JUDGMENTS OF STATUS CUES IN SPEECH

L. S. Harms

Introduction

BEGINNING speech students are sometimes advised to alter their pronunciation and spoken grammar to conform to the practice of the "educated" members of the community. The student is instructed to use socially acceptable speech, to change from substandard to standard speech, or to replace incorrect with correct speech. Before the course is concluded, both instructor and student have invested time and expended effort in an attempt to modify the noticeably different elements in the student's speech.

To "improve" his pronunciation and grammar, the student typically is assigned drill materials. He is asked to memorize a list of frequently "mispronounced" words, for example. That this piecemeal learning process is not efficient and may not be necessary has not typically deterred the attempt at "improvement." Viewed unemotionally, this is a process of status dialect change. Learning a new language, or a new dialect of a known language, is not accomplished by learning a few vocabulary items.

The main question here is whether learning a new status dialect—learning to talk like the "educated" man—is a useful educational goal. When this question is answered satisfactorily, either a more systematic treatment, or no treatment at all, will be indicated.

Mr. Harms is Assistant Professor of Speech, Louisiana State University. This study is based in part on his doctoral dissertation, "Social Judgments of Status Cues in Language," Ohio State University, 1959.

Many basic speech texts[1] have maintained that, by definition, individuals of high employment and education speak acceptably. It follows that listener reaction to samples of speech can be expected to support or contradict this assumption. One significant study has established that some listeners are able to identify the background of the speaker. Putnam and O'Hern[2] recorded one-minute samples of speech from twelve speakers of different educational and social backgrounds. Speaker social status was determined by the Warner *Index*. After hearing these short recordings, seventy university student judges produced mean ratings which correlated +.80 with this measure.

It is now clear that some listeners can identify the background, or status, of a speaker from speech alone. However, the basic question remains unanswered: What difference does it make? Hovland and Weiss[3] prepared several introductions for the same recorded speech. By assigning different "credentials" to the speaker, the same speech produced different amounts of opinion change. Can a listener be expected to assign "credentials" to a speaker when no introduction is given? Will listeners agree on how credible a speaker appears to them when judging from speech cues alone?

[1] See, for example, R. T. Oliver, *et al.*, *Communicative Speech* (New York, 1955), pp. 62-65, or A. H. Monroe, *Principles and Types of Speech* (Chicago, 1955), pp. 136-37.

[2] G. N. Putnam and E. M. O'Hern, "The Status Significance of an Isolated Urban Dialect," *Language*, XXXI (October-December 1955), Part 2, 1-32.

[3] C. I. Hovland and W. Weiss, "The Influence of Source Credibility on Communication Effectiveness," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, XV (Winter 1951), 635-650.

The purposes of this study were: (1) to obtain subjective listener judgments of speaker status and compare these with the classification of an objective status index; (2) to determine how credible listeners judge speakers to be; and (3) to determine the degree of correlation between listener judgments of speaker status and speaker credibility. More simply, is it possible to tell "who a man is" from the way he talks?

Procedure

Nine speakers provided the stimulus materials for this experiment. They were male, between the ages of 30 and 50, and had lived all of their youth and most of their adult years in Ohio or a neighboring state.

The speakers were classed into status groups on the basis of the Hollingshead *Two Factor Index of Status Position*.[4] The two factors are education and occupation. Those three speakers classed as high status (HS) held advanced degrees (Ph.D., D.D.S.) and prestige occupations. They appeared to fit the speech text description of the "educated man" from whom the speech student is not "to vary conspicuously." Those three speakers classed as middle status (MS) had finished high school or a year of college and held middle status occupations. They represented family backgrounds similar to a substantial number of beginning college students. Those three speakers classed as low status (LS) had an eighth-grade education or less and were unskilled workers. They represented the group speech text writers refer to as demonstrating sub-standard or incorrect speech.

On the Hollingshead *Index*, the HS speakers had scores of 11-18; the MS, 37-40; and the LS, 73-77. The range of the *Index* is 11-78. The speakers at a given level were similar in status position, and the status distance between the HS, MS, and LS speakers is considerable. As Table I illustrates, one speaker from each status was randomly assigned to each of the three groups.

TABLE I
Status of Speakers

Group A	Group B	Group C
1 HS	1 LS	1 MS
1 MS	1 HS	1 LS
1 LS	1 MS	1 HS

Each speaker made a 40-60 second field tape-recording. The material was elicited by having each speaker respond to questions and statements on cards such as "How are you," "Ask for the time," etc. All speakers responded readily. The recorded stimulus was essentially "content-free" and was similar to the kind of talk usually associated with the "first meeting" or introduction situation.

One hundred and eighty non-college, adult listeners were used in the experiment. They worked and lived in Columbus, Ohio, and surrounding communities. Listeners were also classed into three status groups according to the Hollingshead procedure. The factors of age and sex are constant for all listener groups; the factors of education and occupation are used as the basis for classification, and therefore vary according to status level. The same grouping plan was used for listeners and speakers. Table II illustrates the status positions of listeners in groups A, B, and C.

TABLE II
Status of Listeners

Group A	Group B	Group C
20 HS	20 HS	20 HS
20 MS	20 MS	20 MS
20 LS	20 LS	20 LS

[4] A. B. Hollingshead, *Two Factor Index of Status Position* (New Haven, 1957), pp. 1-11. See also A. B. Hollingshead and F. C. Redlich, *Social Class and Mental Illness* (New York, 1958), pp. 387-97.

Each speaker was heard by 60 listeners of which 20 were HS, 20 were MS, and 20 were LS. To facilitate the rotation of speakers through listeners, seven was the model size listening group. For example, one-third of the 20 HS listeners in group A heard the speakers in order 1, 2, 3; one-third heard the speakers in order 2, 3, 1; and one-third heard the speakers in order 3, 1, 2. This general procedure was followed for all groups of speakers through all statuses of listener groups.

The stimulus material recorded by the speakers was presented free-field Listening was done in settings as diverse as fire-houses, living rooms, and church basements.

Before the rating forms were administered, both printed and oral instructions were systematically given. One page of the rating form was filled out by each listener immediately after hearing a speaker. The rating form was simple enough to be used by listeners of limited educational backgrounds. Data from four scales were used to provide the results. Two of these centered on speaker status and two on speaker credibility.

Data from the rating sheets were punched on IBM cards. The basic analysis was performed on an IBM 650 computor at The Ohio State University Research Center. The program used was developed by Omar Goode;[5] it provided means and variances for each scale and correlations between pairs of scales. Analyses were made on the basis of population split-half, the three independent parts of the experiment, the status grouping according to speaker and according to listener, and the possible sub-groups in each category. A desk calculator was used for performing the *t* tests.

Initially, the data were handled as though three independent experiments had been performed. Listeners of one alphabetical classification heard only speakers of the same classification, or listeners of groups A heard only speakers of group A; this independence was therefore a fact. The statistically determined similarity of the data from these three identical experiments justified combining the results.

Results and Discussion

Identification of speaker status is the initial problem. Table III illustrates that the ratings assigned by HS, MS, and LS listeners and the scores obtained on the status *Index* placed the speakers in the same groups. In all cases, the differences among rows are significant at the .01 level of confidence.

TABLE III
Mean Ratings of Status

Listeners	Speakers HS	MS	LS
HS	5.22	4.57	2.57
MS	4.87	4.25	2.75
LS	4.85	3.67	2.80

For the MS speakers, the LS listeners assigned mean ratings which differed significantly from the ratings assigned by the MS and HS listeners; 3.67 differs from 4.25 and 4.57. With this exception, differences among columns are not significant.

These results are consistent with those reported earlier by Putnam and O'Hern[6] and they lend indirect support to the position of some speech text writers. Cues are present which enable a listener to recognize the status of the speaker.

The similarity of status *Index* scores and listener ratings does not explain the cause of this agreement. The ratings

[5] Omar Goode, "General Item Analysis Program for IBM 650 Computor" (unpublished program, The Ohio State University, Spring 1958).

[6] Putnam and O'Hern, pp. 25-29.

could be based on word choice, pronunciation, grammatical structure, voice quality, articulation, and several other observable features. The listeners could not indicate whether they based their judgment on one or several features.

TABLE IV
MEAN RATINGS OF CREDIBILITY

Listeners	Speakers HS	MS	LS
HS	4.57	3.75	2.77
MS	4.17	3.82	2.70
LS	4.28	3.33	2.72

Table IV presents the results on credibility. All statuses of listeners made distinctions which were significant at the .01 level of confidence; these distinctions are shown in the rows. The MS listeners did not distinguish between HS and MS speakers; 4.17 does not differ from 3.82.

Listeners agreed on the amount of credibility to assign the speakers. The mean ratings within columns are similar for each speaker status level.

The HS speakers are consistently rated as most credible. Again, here is indirect support for the speech text writer who insists the student talk in the fashion of the "educated man." The listener appears to decide from speech cues alone how credible a man sounds to him.

TABLE V
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RATINGS OF STATUS AND CREDIBILITY

Listeners	Speakers HS	MS	LS
HS	.47	.56	.58
MS	.27	.63	.54
LS	.25	.46	.75

It has now been shown that listeners can rate both speaker status and credibility in a meaningful way. If these two kinds of judgments are to have direct bearing on the speech situation, they must be shown to be closely related. Table V presents the correlation between ratings of status and credibility. All correlations are found to be significant at the .05 level of confidence.

If a given listener rated a speaker as high status, there was some tendency for the listener to rate the speaker as highly credible. It must be emphasized that even though these correlations are significant statistically, they are not high in the social sense. If the status were known, the credibility rating could be predicted with better than chance success, but many errors of prediction would occur because the correlation is low.

Some of the material included in basic speech texts is indirectly supported by the findings of this study. A man's educational background is apparent in even the brief and content-free sample used in this study. In a remarkably short time, listeners are able to evaluate a man in much the same way as he is measured by a complex status index.

It is possible to look at the correlation between listener ratings of status and credibility and arrive at unwarranted conclusions. There is a relationship but it does not appear to be a simple one. The decision to include some listeners who were barely literate precluded the use of a complex measuring instrument needed for the task of isolating the more subtle inter-correlational systems.

Advice to the speech student to talk like educated members of the community appears to be valid in a minimal sense; in order to be fully meaningful it would need to include some qualification. A given speaker may expect to be judged more credible, on the average, by sounding "educated." This, however, is apparently not the only variable operating.

Conclusions

1. Listeners of all statuses on hearing short voice recordings assign mean ratings which group speakers in accordance with their objectively measured status; listeners distinguish among speakers according to status.

2. Listeners of various statuses agree on the amount of credibility they assign to speakers of various statuses; listeners find high status speakers to be the most credible and low status speakers to be the least credible.

3. The correlation between ratings of status and credibility is significant statistically but cannot be said to be high socially.

In his preface to *Pygmalion,* Bernard Shaw held that changing to a socially acceptable way of talking was of considerable importance:

> . . . for encouragement of people troubled with accents that cut them off from all high employment, I may add that the change wrought by Professor Higgins in the flower-girl is neither impossible or uncommon . . . but the thing has to be done scientifically, or the last stage of the aspirant may be worse than the first.

Most listeners reported making their judgments of both status and credibility after hearing only 10 or 15 seconds of speech, even though the recorded samples ran 40-60 seconds. It may be that a listener notices pronunciation and other stereotyped features most readily after he responds to some yet-to-be-identified microscopic speech cues. Shaw suggests this problem be worked on scientifically. Efficient learning of a new dialect would probably require the development of a learning program for presentation to a student by a teaching machine.

When making a student aware of the different and unacceptable features of his speech, the teacher has a strong responsibility to assist the student *systematically.* Otherwise, the loss in speech confidence may far outweigh the possible gain from a partly learned new dialect. Our present knowledge concerning the long-range advantage of one dialect over another is indeed modest. In short, the goal of learning the dialect of the "educated" man should be pursued with an appropriate degree of skepticism.

WALT WHITMAN'S CONCEPT OF THE ORATORICAL IDEAL

Roy S. Azarnoff

WALT WHITMAN was not so much interested in the formal rules of rhetoric as in the concept of the oratorical ideal.[1] The questions about oratory which Whitman tried to answer throughout his life are the same questions which concern teachers and students of speech today. Whitman thought that he might not "get delivered" as a poet and therefore stressed oratory as an alternative or co-equal path. Almost everything he said about the poet's mission can be applied to the orator's as well.

The Preface to the 1855 edition of *Leaves of Grass* outlines three important tasks for the poets. First, they provide spiritual leadership, forming "the consistence of what is to be, from what has been and is." Poets can do this without moralizing or making applications of morals because they know the human soul and know how to reach it with words. Second, poets are "the voice and exposition of liberty. They out of ages are worthy the grand idea—to them it is confirmed, and they must sustain it." Through all obstacles and strategems, they advance to first principles and give guidance by their leadership. And third, poets are grandly American, giving voice to "the jealous and passionate instinct of American standards."

An ideal orator (like the ideal poet) can succeed in his mission only when he has the same qualities which make his nation superb:

> O the orator's joys!
> To inflate the chest, to roll the thunder of the voice out from the rib and throat,
> To make the people rage, weep, hate, desire with yourself . . .
> To lead America . . . with a great tongue.
> ("A Song of Joys")

The ideal orator, in Whitman's concept, has many roles and finds himself carrying out his public teaching in many differing situations. By "powerful words, orations, uttered with copiousness and decision," he keeps up living interest in public questions and always holds the ear of the people. An orator in his role of *wander-speaker* is to "dart hither or thither, as some great emergency might demand—the greatest champion America could know, yet holding no office or emolument whatever,—but first in the esteem of men and women."[2]

As a *leader-teacher* an ideal orator seeks to argue rather than declaim. He inspires voters to ground political action on "long-cherished principles and calm reflection" rather than on "momentary

Mr. Azarnoff is Instructor in Speech, Boston University.

[1] Whitman's interest in oratory was first heralded when Thomas B. Harned, one of Whitman's literary executors, read a paper, "Walt Whitman and Oratory," at a meeting of the Walt Whitman Fellowship held on May 31, 1896. This article is in *The Complete Writings of Walt Whitman*, VIII, eds. Richard M. Bucke, Thomas B. Harned, and Horace L. Traubel (New York, 1902), 244-60. For a detailed account of the sources of this material see William L. Finkel, "Walt Whitman's Manuscript Notes on Oratory," *American Literature*, XXII (March 1950), 29-53.

[2] Walt Whitman, notebook entry for April 24, 1857, in the Whitman Manuscript Collection, Manuscripts Division, Library of Congress.

excitement and sudden impulses."[3] In the role of *lecturer-teacher* he selects a "tangible living subject, . . . bringing a vigorous practical understanding to bear on the subject, so as to present it in its most lucid form, accompanied by the most useful deductions and suggestions. . . ."[4]

As *preacher-teacher* no orthodoxy becomes more important to the orator than his effort to "instruct" his parishioners in the ways of mankind. His prayers are to probe "to the very depths of that latent conscience and remorse which probably lie somewhere in the background of every life, every soul."[5] An ideal orator, then, is to "raise a voice for far superber themes:

> To exalt the present and the real
> To teach the average man the glory of his daily work and trade.
>
> ("Song of the Exposition")

Walt Whitman heard "nearly all of them," the voices of Calhoun, Benton, Silas Wright, Clay, Webster, and Seward. He heard Presidents Hays, Harrison, and Van Buren, and spent many hours listening in the Congress. On the east side of Broadway near Pearl Street was the New York Tabernacle, where Whitman listened to the abolitionist speakers, including Wendell Phillips and William Lloyd Garrison. He heard Edward Everett and Henry Ward Beecher. At the Historical and Athenaeum Societies' halls he listened to Bryant and Emerson lecture. In Washington he heard Professor Agassiz and was "very much pleased." In Philadelphia he heard Robert Ingersoll.

But it was in 1859 and 1860 during his visits to Boston that Whitman heard the "one essentially perfect orator . . . one who satisfied those depths of the emotional nature that in most cases go through life quite untouch'd, unfed—who held every hearer by spells which no conventionalist, high or low—nor any pride or composure, nor resistance of intellect—could stand against for ten minutes."[6]

The "perfect orator," Father Taylor (the Rev. Edward Taylor, Methodist minister to the Seaman's Bethel Chapel in Boston), preached to Yankee sailors in a little, old, sea-church down by the wharves.[7] When this man preached or prayed, "the rhetoric and art, the mere words, (which usually play such a big part) seem'd altogether to disappear, and the *live feeling* advanced upon you and seiz'd you with a power before unknown."[8] His sermons were "majestic and picturesque." Colloquial in language, the allusions to ships and the ocean and the sailors' lives were especially well adapted to his seafaring audience. "A few arguments, and of the best, but always brief and simple," were the basic material of the speeches. The "marvelous effects" of the vocal utterance itself added to Father Taylor's "personal electricity" and made hearing him a memorable experience. The oratorical ideal which Father Taylor exemplified, Whitman stressed throughout his writings on public speakers. The prime requisites are intelligent thought, emotional commitment, and grand delivery and language.

"The importance of public speaking is to say something," Whitman urged in

[3] From Whitman's editorial in the Brooklyn *Daily Times* of January 30, 1857, cited in *I Sit and Look Out*, eds. Emory Holloway and Vernolian Schwartz (New York, 1932), p. 110.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 179-181.

[5] Walt Whitman, "Father Taylor (and Oratory)" in *Complete Prose Works* (Boston, 1907), p. 386.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 385.

[7] Cf., Egbert S. Oliver, "Emerson's Almost Perfect Orator: Edward Taylor," *Today's Speech*, VIII (April 1960), 20-22.

[8] "Father Taylor," p. 386.

his notebook on oratory.[9] Oratory is essentially impassioned argument. However, a speech that deals only in passionate appeals cannot hope to be successful except on rare occasions. There can be no true eloquence without solid thought, for declamation "that has no substratum of substantial mind work is mere literary syllabub, frothy, windy, and in large doses sickening." A speech "must have its intellectual completeness—its beauty—its reasoning to convince—its proofs etc., and finally it must have its reference to the spiritual—to immortality—to the mystic in man—that which knows without proof, and is beyond materialism."

An ideal orator is "beyond materialism" for his eloquence derives from his earnestness and honesty of conviction. "His heart's desire is to communicate with the mind of his audience, to lay hold of it and wield it from some cherished purpose. Neither can his oratory be of the highest order unless his earnestness springs from thoroughly honest conviction and passionate love of truth." The oratorical ideal is "something to serve the people—the mass; when it fails to do that it is false to its promises."

Walt Whitman's concept of the oratorical ideal is in many ways contemporary. Whitman had concerns which still challenge us. Writing of oratory he asked, "Why is it that the unsophisticated practices often strike deeper than the train'd ones?" "Is not . . . the first, last, and most important quality of all, in training for a 'finish'd speaker,' generally unsought, unreck'd of, both by teacher and pupil?"[10] While men cannot be given "the gift and faculty divine," they can learn from explanation and practice. He practiced as a youth in Brooklyn when he considered becoming an orator to proclaim his faith in that way. "I trained for all that—spouted in the woods, down by the shore, in the noise of Broadway where nobody could hear me: spouted, eternally spouted, and spouted again."[11]

As a young man Whitman taught school in Long Island, and among the subjects he offered was speech. At that time he was taking an active role in the debating society of Smithtown.[12] He questioned whether speech training is worthwhile, but his writing and his conduct seem to give an affirmative answer.

Another of his notes on oratory defines rhetoric as "the artificial composition of an address, as dividing it into parts—also the school-rules for its utterance, etc." Oratory might become "artificial composition" and more attention be given to technique than thought.

Delivery, composed of vocal quality, gesture, and language, has to be natural and not studied or artificial. For an orator's eloquence comes from the "spontaneous results of his mind being fully occupied with his subject. . . ." Whitman wrote in the 1855 Preface, "The fluency and ornaments of the finest poems or music or orations or recitations, are not independent but dependent." Every goal has its own language, its own form of expression. Eloquence results not from stilted sentences and ornate diction, but rather from clear strong conviction. This con-

[9] See Finkel, p. 35. This monograph demonstrates that Whitman "borrowed" many of the items in his oratory notebook from an address by Charles Murray Nairne and other sources, but concludes that this confirms rather than disproves Whitman's interest in the spoken word.

[10] "Father Taylor," p. 387.

[11] Horace Traubel, *With Walt Whitman in Camden*, I (Boston, 1906), 5.

[12] Katherine Molinoff, *An Unpublished Whitman Manuscript: The Record Book of the Smithtown Debating Society, 1837-1838* (New York, 1941), pp. 3-5.

viction cannot be found in the "sort of rhetoric which informs ingenuous youth that the first sentence of an essay should be short and the second long. . . ." Speechmaking by a man whose sole aim is not to express his thought and feeling but to achieve the appearance of elegance and style is insincere.[13] Sincerity is reflected in the demeanor and voice of the speaker and it is this which wins audiences, which "touches the soul."

[13] Whitman wrote these remarks in an article concerning a July 4th oration by Dr. R. T. Hallock. This article, "The Child and the Man," appeared in *Life Illustrated*, August 2, 1856. Cited in *New York Dissected*, eds. Emory Holloway and Ralph Adimari (New York, 1936), p. 211 n.

Walt Whitman's interest in oratory was lifelong. This interest stemmed in large measure from his desire to communicate his message of social democracy through whatever media were available. He viewed an ideal orator, like an ideal poet, as a man on a mission. Conviction, ideas, and artistry of communication were the orator's tools; the platform, the classroom, the legislative hall were his working place; spiritual leadership, liberty, and America were his job. Yet Whitman recognized that the oratorical ideal was not always met and that shallow speech and demagoguery always need to be guarded against.

THE ORAL TEXT OF EZRA POUND'S "THE SEAFARER"

J. B. Bessinger

OUR readers must be well acquainted with this wonderful translation," exclaimed *The New Age* in 1913, "but who will tire of it?"[1] The work so praised had been published only the year before, and in the ensuing half-century enthusiasts, detractors, and apologists have disagreed about the merit of Pound's "The Seafarer" as a translation of the poem in the tenth-century *Exeter Book*. Yet it has won a deserved reputation for its uncommon vigor and its impressionistic, archaistic rendering of Old English diction and verse-rhythm. Certainly the discussion it has caused forms part of this century's literary history.[2] The poet's unpublished readings of this and other poems on recorded discs in the Woodberry Poetry Room at the Lamont Library, Harvard University, should therefore interest followers of the lively art of ancient and modern oral verse, historians of modern poetry at large, and those who, like Pound, see in poetic translation a clue to the poetic process itself. His reading of "The Seafarer" has the added value, as will be seen below, of throwing a little light on the author's attitude to the poem considered purely as a translation. Taken down during his visit to Harvard on May 17, 1939, these recordings were never issued in the Harvard Vocarium series,[3] and so are not available to the general public among the many recordings of poetry, drama, folk song, and philological exempla which are a feature of contemporary oral-literary culture.

"The Seafarer" is one of fifteen selections originally preserved on three acetate discs, more recently regrouped on

Mr. Bessinger is Associate Professor of English, University of Toronto. He is author of A Short Dictionary of Anglo-Saxon Poetry, *and is now preparing a concordance to the Columbia* Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records *for the new Cornell Concordance Series.*

[1] *The New Age*, XII (April 3, 1913), 533, in an unsigned review of *Ripostes of Ezra Pound* (London, 1912). In the present article Pound's translation is quoted, with spelling normalized, from *The Exeter Book*, eds. George Philip Krapp and Elliott Van Kirk Dobbie (New York, 1936), pp. 143-147. I wish to thank Professor Frederick C. Packard, Jr., who directed the production of the recordings discussed here, for special information concerning them; and Mr. John L. Sweeney, Curator of the Woodberry Poetry Room at Harvard University, for allowing me to describe and discuss the Poetry Room's unpublished recordings.

[2] Representative recent comment: *The Translations of Ezra Pound*, introd. Hugh Kenner (London, 1953), pp. 9-12, and the review of this book in *Times Literary Supplement*, September 18, 1953, p. 596, give high praise to Pound and his work, with discussion of "The Seafarer," as does David Wright in "Translations," *Encounter*, VIII (April 1957), 85-87. Spirited criticism and qualified defense of the poem are found in the exchanges between correspondents in *TLS*, June 25, 1954, p. 409; July 9, p. 447; July 16, p. 457; August 20, p. 529. John Hollander in *On Translation*, ed. Reuben A. Brower (Cambridge, Mass., 1959), pp. 210-213, has some good remarks on Pound's translation and the criticism it has generated. Marianne Moore, trans., *The Fables of La Fontaine* (New York, 1954), p. x, writes of her debt to Pound as poet and translator, with reference to "The Seafarer."

[3] See Frederick C. Packard Jr., "The Harvard Vocarium Discs," *Harvard Library Bulletin*, III (Autumn 1949), 441-445. There is a recent long-playing recording, *Ezra Pound Reading* (Caedmon TC1122), in which two titles ("Hugh Selwyn Mauberley" and "Cantico del Sole") duplicate those in the Harvard recordings. "The Seafarer" does not appear on the Caedmon disc, and there are no copies elsewhere of the Harvard version of this recording.

two discs.[4] "Canto XXX ('Compleynte')" is the only unfinished reading among these selections; after ten lines and a slip of the tongue Pound crisply ends this reading with, "Call that off, it's no good." The discs preserve with evident fidelity the poet's reading style, the measured, moderate tempo of which adapts easily to sardonic or elegaic, energetic or muted variations in tone. One notices oratorical or theatrical vocal mannerisms, trilled *r*'s and an idiosyncratic quaver on stressed syllables, which call to mind Pound's association with William Butler Yeats, whose reading style was similar to this, and with the development of contemporary lyric drama. Some of the poems are declaimed with a kind of controlled fury, but Pound makes "The Seafarer" an introspective, almost placid exploration of nostalgia and grief. Possibly as a result of a prolonged recording session, the poet's voice sounds tired during some of the readings, and it is hard to decide whether fatigue may have affected this reading of "The Seafarer," for on at least one other occasion Pound gave a rather noisier performance of it, described by one who heard him then as "powerful, strident, exhilarating."[5]

In any case the present rendition is memorable in its own way. An arresting feature of it, and of several other of the readings as well, is Pound's use of a rhythmic accompaniment produced by repeatedly and alternately striking a pair of kettledrums tuned to a tonic-dominant interval; these strokes provide an extra dimension of drama to his delivery. They occur anywhere in a line or before or after it, either alone or upon a syllable stressed also by the reader. Sometimes muffled and tentative, they more often sound out to suggest a boom of surf or thunder, a device ominously evocative in "The Seafarer," especially in conjunction with words like "eternal," "earth," and "waneth." The author's percussive self-accompaniment, amusingly enough, seems to have anticipated not only contemporary poetry recitals with bongo drums in night clubs, but an important modern theory of Anglo-Saxon poetics, that of John C. Pope in *The Rhythm of Beowulf* (New Haven, 1942). Pope's theory of versification implies a rhythmical background traditionally furnished by a harp, which in certain verses sounded a major initial accent while the voice was silent. On the other hand, Pound's improvisations with the drums are not strictly or regularly complementary to the verse-rhythm; in his readings the extraneous beats are heard, often as if at random, about once in five lines on the average, while according to Pope's system we should expect several times that number of initial rests (or solo beats for the harp) in an equivalent number of Old English verse-pairs, and these would be present only in specific metrical types.[6]

A comparison of Pound's oral versions with the printed texts of his poems reveals some free variation on the re-

[4] Woodberry Poetry Room, D 867.5/8, side 1: "Canto LVI." Side 2: "Canto XVII." D 867.5/9, side 1: "The Seafarer"; "Hugh Selwyn Mauberley," I, II, IV, V; "Yeux Glauques"; "Envoy (1919)." Side 2: "Mauberley (1920)," I, II; "Homage to Sextus Propertius," VI; "Canto XLV"; "Canto XXX" [incomplete]; "Cantico del Sole."

[5] Richard Eberhart, "Pound's New Cantos," *Quarterly Review of Literature*, V (1949), 178.

[6] Pope's reading of OE poetry may be heard on a LP recording (*Beowulf and Chaucer*, Lexington 5505). Other selections, including parts of "The Seafarer," are read according to Pope's theory by Francis P. Magoun, Jr. (*Readings from Old English Prose and Verse*, Harvard Vocarium L-6000), and by Magoun and Gretchen Paulus (*Readings from Anglo-Saxon Poetry*, Harvard Vocarium L-7000); cf. Charles W. Dunn, *Early English Poetry* (Folkways FL 9851). All these recordings make for an instructive comparison of OE rhythms with Pound's imitative measures.

citer's part, most noticeably perhaps in "The Seafarer." Although such variants are logically and grammatically trivial, the basic sense of any line remaining unaltered by them, still the effect of a word dropped or inserted of course revises the rhythm of a line, and in the case of "The Seafarer," the considerable historical impact of which came from its adaptation of alliterative stress-rhythms to contemporary verse, the slightest metrical changes call attention to themselves. For instance, Pound orally adds the definite articles italicized here to the lines, "Beats out the breath from *the* doom-gripped body," and, "Nor *the* gold-giving lords like those gone"; he omits the adjective from "Frame on the *fair* earth 'gainst foes his malice." The effect of these changes, it will be seen, is to modify sequences of crowded syllabic emphasis, as if the poet were smoothing over the stern angularity of his poem, however lightly, twenty-seven years after its publication. Naturally his right to do so is not in question; rather the poem is that much more interesting if the poet was recomposing it, deliberately or not, after so long a time. But a problem of historical criticism does emerge from this comparison of texts, and a statement by T. S. Eliot helps formulate it: "A recording of a poem read by its author is no more definitive an 'interpretation' than a recording of a symphony conducted by the composer. . . . What the recording of a poem by its author can and should preserve, is the way that poem sounded to the author when he had finished it. . . . The chief value of the author's record, then, is as a guide to the rhythms."[7] If, however, the author changes the rhythms by altering his printed text in a recording, in what ways, if at all, does the authority of the recording supersede that of the printed text? Textual critics, working increasingly with recorded oral variants alongside printed versions, will have to deal with such matters sooner or later, for anyone who has heard poets reading their own work will have noticed many such variations, often more crucial in context than those listed above, whether deriving from intermediate revision or from accidental circumstances in the act of performance.

A different problem is raised by a comparison of the authorial written and oral texts of "The Seafarer" with the Old English text of the poem, since Pound's reading gives new authority to printed versions of his poem in places where, one could argue, not a new rhythmic emphasis or a fresh interpretation was needed, but some kind of textual revision. Faced by a crux twice certified, the reader and listener may feel an acute sympathy for Pound's own complaint: "All translation is a thankless, or is at least most apt to be a thankless and desolate undertaking."[8] And again: "There *is no literal* translation of a thing where the beauty is melted into the original phrase."[9] But of course failures of translation might be many and radical without impairing the value of a new poem, if they left it a self-intelligible whole. That is why a critic intent on his own thankless undertaking will be disturbed that certain flaws of translation in the earliest printing of "The Seafarer," faithfully reproduced in all subsequent editions, were reiterated by the author in 1939, in the course of a reading which changed

[7] Quoted by John L. Sweeney, "A Place for Poetry: The Woodberry Poetry Room in Widener and Lamont," *HLB*, VIII (1954), 65-73. Notice also (p. 70) a contrary opinion by Rainer Maria Rilke, stressing the absolute authority of the poet-reader.

[8] T. S. Eliot, ed., *Literary Essays of Ezra Pound* (New York, 1954), p. 268.

[9] D. D. Paige, ed., *The Letters of Ezra Pound* (London, 1951), p. 226.

his text in less important ways.[10] This is not, one hopes, a matter of ticking off Pound's famous and often surely deliberate "howlers," or of over-ingeniously defending them. Unless the reader is following Pound's translation as a guide to the original's exact meaning, he has no right to experience shock when the translator cuts short the original text and omits specifically Christian references from the remainder; at least we should recall that scholarly editors have operated upon this text in a similar fashion, and critics have been known to regard its Christianity as a stumbling block.[11] Nor, probably, will most readers object when the author approximates the sound rather than the meaning of an Old English word, even though these semantic changes entail displacement of larger meanings in the poem: OE *stearn* 'tern, genus *Sterna*' appears as "stern [of a boat]"; *twéo(n)* 'doubt' or 'separation'[12] as "twain"; *bláed* 'glory' as "blade [= sword]"; and so on. But a listener may well be puzzled to find that the oral version leaves unimproved and more or less impenetrable certain passages that must have been mistranslated or misprinted in 1912, and that must have stood out in 1939 as they do now. The most striking example is in the rendering of the original text at lines 94-96:[13]

> . . . Nor may he then the flesh-cover, whose life ceaseth,
> Nor eat the sweet nor feel the sorry,
> Nor stir hand nor think in mid heart . . . .

In this passage Pound chose to follow the Old English closely, but, difficult as parts of the original poem are, there is no ambiguity here to justify the incoherence of the translation: "Then, when life escapes him, his fleshly form cannot taste what is sweet, nor feel pain, nor stir a hand, nor think with the mind." It is hard to guess what went wrong. Possibly the translator misconstrued the subject of the sentence without noticing that the auxiliary verb (which is conative, not permissive) now lacks a complement; or perhaps he meant to turn *fláesc-hama* boldly into verb and object (as if "cover [his] body"), in which case the hyphen of "flesh-cover" is an intrusive misprint. It would be pointless to linger on such a detail, except that we may hear on this valuable record the poet's voice declaiming lines like these, destined apparently to rank as textual cruces with editors unborn, and remember Pound's brave remark in another place: "Anyone who can, from the text as it stands, discern what happens to whom in the final lines of this sonnet, is at liberty to emend my translation."[14]

Whether from admiration or timid-

[10] According to John Edwards, *A Preliminary Checklist of the Writings of Ezra Pound* (New Haven, 1953), the poem was reprinted in *Ripostes* (Boston, 1913); I have not seen this item. In all subsequent reprintings listed by Edwards, however, and in *Selected Poems* (New York, 1957), the text is substantially unaltered. A minor textual variant is the modernization of "layed" to "laid" in *Cathay* (London, 1915), in the line "The blade is laid low." Subsequent printings revert to "layed." Evidently the author and his editors consider the text as fixed; no significant revisions have been made in it.

[11] Recent critical belief in the organic unity of the poem challenges an older opinion that parts of it were moralistic Christian additions to a flawed pagan original, an opinion reflected in many school editions including those most familiar to English and American students: *Sweet's Anglo-Saxon Reader*, rev. C. T. Onions (Oxford, 1950), which ends the poem with line 108b (of 124 lines), and *Bright's Anglo-Saxon Reader*, rev. and enl. by James R. Hulbert (New York, 1949), which curtails the text even more drastically at line 64a. The older view is "at least partially resurrected" by Jackson J. Campbell, "Oral Poetry in *The Seafarer*," *Speculum*, XXXV (January 1960), 87-96, who cites critics defending the unitary view on pp. 90-91 and notes. This last article is criticized by Wayne A. O'Neil, "Another Look at Oral Poetry in *The Seafarer*," *Speculum*, XXXV (October 1960), 596-600.

[12] See *Medium Ævum*, XXVIII (1959), 13-14.

[13] Cf. the rendering of ll. 39-43 ("For this . . . his lord will."), cited as "nonsense" by Kenneth Sisam, *TLS*, June 25, 1954, p. 409.

[14] *Translations of Ezra Pound* (note to Cavalcanti's "Sonnet XXVII"), p. 79.

ity, the ordinary student will hardly venture to emend "The Seafarer," but there seems no reason why Pound himself, a noted editor of other poets, should not do so, or designate another for the task. "When I am *not* writing Cantos," he has declared, "I do not care a hoot how much I am *edited*."[15] For the moment, however, we may only conclude that this conspicuously unedited poem has survived on merits that have little to do with those of an accurate translation. As the recording helps to demonstrate, it is a free imitation, phonic and rhythmic rather than thematic and verbal, by a major poet whose scholarship as a translator seems largely irrelevant. In the 1912 poem, after all, he vividly if partially suggested the dramatic shape of a former poem, and he did the same in his performance on the unique Harvard recording—a remarkable oral experiment, a document in the history of modern verse.

[15] *The Letters of Ezra Pound*, p. 401.

EDITORIAL

MIDTERM REPORT

This issue, No. 2 of Volume XLVII, is the sixth journal published by the incumbent board of editors. Six more issues, God willing, will be forthcoming under the present administration.

All issues have been published on schedule, and thanks goes to our printer. The articles printed are a selection from the many manuscripts submitted. Since papers are not commissioned or solicited, there is no absolute standard for publication; the printed journal presents those articles judged to be most worthy of publication among those submitted. All of the articles published have been approved by the appropriate associate editors. There is no backlog of articles, and papers now submitted can be considered for early publication.

Since *QJS* publishes scholarly articles of general significance in all areas of speech, there is a problem of balance. In some areas, a number of papers have been received: Drama and Theatre; American Public Address; Rhetorical Theory and Criticism. In other areas, few manuscripts have been submitted: Speech and Hearing Disorders; Voice, Diction, and Pronunciation; Mass Communication and Opinion.

In a world of increasing specialization, with increasing attention to minutiae of minutiae, the editors are trying to present articles which make a contribution in a specific area, and also have some general significance and interest. They are trying to avoid articles of narrowed specialty, and articles cast in technical or obscurantist language. To make a specific reference, it is hoped that the lead article in this issue, on Brecht, is a contribution in drama and theatre, and also has some significance and interest to persons in other areas of speech.

The editors are aware of the press for publication, and wish that more short papers (1,500-2,000 words) might be received, so that a larger number of authors and subjects might be published. There seems to be a trend toward lengths of thesis proportions. Prospective authors might be reminded that one of the principles of art is selectivity.

As for the mechanical details, may we remind contributors that *The MLA Style Sheet* is the general guide. A copy of this can be procured from The Modern Language Association of America, 6 Washington Square North, New York 3, for fifty cents. For matters not covered in this pamphlet, *A Manual of Style* (University of Chicago Press) should be consulted.

The Fifteenth Editor thanks you for your support, and welcomes your comments, inquiries, criticisms, and MSS contributions.

THE FORUM

FORTY-FIFTH ANNUAL CONVENTION
SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA
Sheraton-Jefferson Hotel, St. Louis, December 27-30, 1960

EXCERPTS FROM THE MINUTES OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL

The fifth annual session of the Administrative Council convened with President Kenneth G. Hance presiding.

Sixty seconds of silent tribute was paid to the memory of W. Norwood Brigance and Henry Ewbank, Sr., both of whom passed away in 1960.

The Executive Vice-President, J. Jeffery Auer, reported that the NCTE Liaison Committee with joint membership of the SAA-AETA had been reactivated, and that the SAA representatives were Wallace Bacon and Donald Bryant. Auer moved that the NCTE Liaison Committee be established as an *Ad Hoc* Committee and that proper steps be taken to establish it as a coordinating committee. Seconded. Carried.

Bryant moved that the Executive Secretary proceed immediately to implement the portion of the report of the Committee on Publications which read, "that a revision be prepared of the last (1957) edition of the Knower 'Table of Contents' index to the *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *Speech Monographs* and *Speech Teacher*." Seconded. Carried. The recommendation of the Committee on Publications that *QJS* carry the union label (initial request having been made by the editor of *QJS*) was approved by common consent. Henry Mueller moved that *Speech Monographs* and *Speech Teacher* carry the union label at the base of the inside front cover. Second. Carried.

Elizabeth Carr, Robert Haakenson, and William McCoard were nominated to represent the Council on the Nominating Committee. Mrs. Carr was elected.

To implement the report of the Committee for Assistance to Foreign Universities, Auer moved that the SAA should specifically urge the following people to find government funds to pay shipping charges of books sent abroad in the future: the President, Secretary of State, the Director of the United States Information Agency, the Director of ICA, the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and the Chairman of the House Foreign Relations Committee. Seconded. Carried.

Wilbur Gilman reported on a suggested constitutional revision relating to the interest groups. John Black moved that Gilman suggest the revision of Article X, Sections 5 and 8, of the Constitution to transfer the duty of reporting the activities of the interest groups to the Legislative Assembly from the vice chairman to the delegate of the interest group to the Assembly, and that the matter be referred to the Constitutional Committee. Seconded. Carried.

Gilman distributed mimeographed copies of the manual he prepared for the operation of interest groups. The Council unanimously commended Gilman for the job he did on the manual.

Mueller moved that the SAA adopt a formula for determining place of conventions. Seconded. Carried. Mueller moved to adopt the week between Christmas and New Year's Day as a permanent time. Seconded. Carried.

Ralph Nichols moved that the SAA adopt a four-year cycle with an eight-year term to follow the calendar of: Chicago, 1964; Philadelphia, 1965; Chicago, 1966; Los Angeles, 1967; Chicago, 1968; New York, 1969; Chicago, 1970; San Francisco, 1971; (subject to hotel accommodations). Seconded. Carried.

The Executive Secretary was directed to seek hotel accommodations for this eight-year period. Nichols moved that the first extension of this calendar be reviewed in the convention at Chicago in 1964. Seconded. Carried.

John Dietrich moved that the Time and Place Committee be charged with the responsibility of making an annual audit of the effectiveness of this pattern and of taking formal cognizance of any complaints about service or hotels. Seconded. Carried.

Nichols moved that the Council ask the Constitutional Revision Committee to redraft Article III of the Constitution creating Section 2 for the purpose of urging the membership to join the National Education Association, and a Section 3 stating that the SAA is a constituent member of the American Council on Education. Seconded. Carried. Dietrich moved that the SAA underwrite annually the membership in

the NEA of the officers and editors of the Association. Seconded. Carried.

Dietrich presented the report of the Committee on Committees and moved the acceptance of the report. Seconded. Carried.

Robert Jeffrey displayed the required number of petitions for the formation of an Interest Group in Theatre and Drama and read the resolution of the proposed interest group requesting recognition. Dietrich moved the approval of the formation of this interest group. Seconded. Carried. Waldo Braden recommended that a letter be written to AETA informing them of our action and expressing good wishes to AETA.

Braden moved that the Council create a committee of five to investigate a permanent home for the SAA outside the city of Washington, D. C., to be appointed by Kenneth Hance as the current President of the Association. The committee was instructed to report to the Council at the first meeting at the 1961 convention. Seconded. Carried.

Braden moved that the action of the Legislative Assembly requesting the Administrative Council to take the steps necessary to secure prompt consideration of an increase in membership dues be referred to the Finance Committee which takes office in July, 1961. Seconded. Carried.

Braden moved that a committee be appointed by the officers of 1960 to investigate the possibility of raising funds to support the establishment of a national headquarters as provided for in the By-Laws Article I, Section 7. Seconded. Carried.

Dietrich moved that the term "regular" in Article I, Section 7 be defined to mean the kind of membership which the individual has held for the majority of his years with the Association. Seconded. Carried.

Leroy Laase moved that a study of NUEA-SAA relationships concerning national headquarters be referred to the 1961 Executive Vice-President. Seconded. Carried.

Karl Robinson moved that the Association strongly support the actions of the Committee on International Discussion and Debate. Seconded. Carried.

Nichols moved that the Council empower the Executive Vice-President to act for the Association in moments when critical issues arise, subject only to the mail referendum of the other officers of the Association. Seconded. Carried.

Nichols moved that President Hance appoint a member of the Association to represent SAA at the meeting of the American Council on Education on January 25, 1961 to act on the nomination of Logan Wilson to succeed Arthur S. Adams as President of the Council. Seconded. Carried.

Ernest Wrage moved that the Interest Group in Personal and Social Psychology be granted its request to change its name to Behavioral Sciences. Seconded. Carried.

Braden moved that the Council concur with the action of the Legislative Assembly in changing the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Certification of Regional Accrediting Associations to a Service Committee, and that it be renamed the Committee on Certification of Teachers of Speech. Seconded. Carried.

Laase moved that the President and the Second Vice-President of the Association be empowered to call an emergency session of the Council to meet jointly with the Executive Committee of the Legislative Assembly when such action is deemed desirable. Seconded. Carried.

Nichols read a letter from Raymond C. Van Dusen about the graduate record examinations. Auer moved to refer to Franklin Knower for review Parts 1 and 2 of the letter which read as follows: "(1) Inasmuch as the Graduate Record Examination in Speech has become obsolescent, that arrangements be made with the proper agency for its revision, (2) and, that the revision be constructed in such a manner as to report sub-scores in the various speech areas—public address, theatre, radio-television, and speech science-pathology-audiology—thus providing an instrument for guiding graduate students as well as finding the general level of knowledge." Seconded. Carried.

Laase moved to refer to the Finance Committee Part 3 of Van Dusen's letter which reads: "(3) Further, that the Council consider the allocation of funds, if necessary, to aid in financing the revision." Seconded. Carried.

Mueller moved that the Council go on record that the appointment of an SAA representative to the committee described in Action Report K is not an administrative matter but one of policy. Seconded. Carried.

Mueller moved that Nichols appoint Hance as a committee of one to study and make recommendations concerning programs at conventions planned in honor of deceased members, and report to the Council in 1961. Seconded. Carried. The Council expressed its support of Braden in any decision of policy he might make

for handling the problem for the 1961 convention.

Robert Gunderson raised the question of whether the President or the Executive Vice-President should sign official correspondence to external associations. It was informally decided that the two officers should keep in touch and determine between themselves which should sign correspondence.

Mueller suggested for consideration the possibility that a committee be formed to study the organizing of a Constitutional Interpretation Committee.

ROBERT C. JEFFREY
Executive Secretary

EXCERPTS FROM THE MINUTES OF THE 1960 LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

The Second Vice-President of the Speech Association of America, Waldo Braden, presided at each of the four meetings of the fifth annual session of the Legislative Assembly in the Crystal Room, Sheraton-Jefferson Hotel.

Charles Redding as chairman of the Credentials Committee reported that sixty-one certified members were present. He announced that elected members cannot be represented by alternates but that constituent groups may choose alternates for those originally listed.

Elton Abernathy moved that the minutes of the 1959 Legislative Assembly as published be approved. Seconded. Carried.

The Speaker announced the appointment of the following persons: as sergeants-at-arms, Paul Brandes and Merrill Baker; as tellers, John Penn (chairman), Ronald Reid, Eugene White, Edward Rogge, Betty May Collins, and Robert Capel.

Paul Carmack reported for the Rules Committee and moved the adoption of the following amendment to the rules as an added Section 3 to Rule IV, "Floor Privileges": "When a person claims to be a delegate but is not named in the list of delegates provided by the Executive Secretary, it is the duty of the Credentials Committee to investigate and rule on the validity of the claim as soon as the facts can be ascertained. The Committee has the authority to certify delegates provisionally during the period of investigation." Seconded. Carried.

The following officials made brief oral reports: Karl Robinson, Editor of *The Speech Teacher*; Kenneth Hance, President; J. Jeffery Auer, Executive Vice-President; Robert Jeffrey, Executive Secretary.

Fred Haberman as chairman reported for the Nominating Committee of the Assembly. Other members of the committee were Joseph Baccus, Waldo Braden, Mary Louise Gehring, and David Phillips.

The written reports of the interest groups, the committees, and the officials of the Association were accepted.

At the joint meeting of the Assembly and the Administrative Council, Braden as chairman reported for the Finance Committee. The report was accepted. Carroll Arnold reported for Wayne Thompson, Chairman of the Committee on Time and Place. John Dietrich presented a substitute proposal, which the Assembly approved as amended. This action recommended that (1) the conventions be held in metropolitan hotels in December for the years 1964-1971, and that (2) the locations be as follows: 1964, Midwest; 1965, East; 1966, Midwest; 1967, West; 1968, Midwest; 1969, East; 1970, Midwest; 1971, West. The joint meeting was adjourned.

Dietrich as chairman reported for the Committee on Committees. The Assembly accepted the report.

Rogge as chairman reported for the Tellers' Committee. The following persons were elected:

Representative on SAA Nominating Committee: Mary Louise Gehring.

Representatives on SAA Committee on Committees: Paul A. Carmack, Thomas R. Lewis, and Robert T. Oliver.

Representatives of interest groups to serve on the Executive Committee: Albert J. Croft and Kim Giffin.

Representatives of geographical areas on the Executive Committee: Ray Irwin, H. Philip Constans, Henry L. Ewbank, Jr., and James H. McBath.

Members of the 1961 Nominating Committee of the Legislative Assembly: Robert Huber (chairman), Paul Brandes, Frank Davis, William McCoard, and Karl R. Wallace.

Thomas Rousse as chairman reported for the Consultation Committee. The report as a whole was received, and parts were implemented by the following Assembly actions: (1) The Committee on Cooperation Between the SAA and the Regional Associations is to study the advisability of a shared fee among the SAA and the several regional and state associations; (2) The Executive Vice-President is to act upon the recommendation that SAA urge the state departments of education to include speech consultants and speech correction con-

sultants within their Divisions of Instruction if such consultants are not now employed.

Wilbur Gilman as Interest Group Advisor reported. He stated that the "Manual for the Interest Groups" had been mimeographed and would be distributed at the 1960 meetings of the groups.

Martin Andersen as chairman reported for the Committee on Resolutions. The Assembly disposed of the action reports as follows:

Action Report A—That the SAA establish a permanent national office in Washington, D. C., with a full-time, salaried Executive Secretary. No action was taken, but a substitute (see A.R.P.) was approved.

Action Report B—That the appropriate officers of committees consider the desirability of joint meetings of the Administrative Council and the Executive Committee of the Assembly. Approved.

Action Report C—That the Executive Committee appoint an assistant (s) to the Clerk with the responsibility of maintaining liaison between the Assembly and the Administrative Council. Approved.

Action Report D—That constitutional amendments be prepared providing (1) that secretaries of interest groups serve two-year terms, (2) that representatives of interest groups to the Committee on Professional Ethics and Standards serve three-year terms and that one third of these terms expire each year, and (3) that the position of alternate for the delegate from the interest groups to the Assembly be established. Approved.

Action Report E—That a constitutional amendment be drafted providing for the elimination of interest groups which do not live up to their obligations. Not reported out of committee.

Action Report F—That the appropriate officers be instructed to create physical conditions which are conducive to the maximum comfort of the delegates and to the most effective deliberation of the Assembly. Not reported out of committee.

Action Report G—That the SAA create a "Permanent Home Committee" with the duties of (1) acquiring a suitable plot of ground in Washington, D. C., or in a Midwestern city with an active and independent speech department and (2) investigating possible ways of raising approximately $100,000 for the erection of a permanent headquarters. No action was taken, but a substitute (see A.R.P.) was approved.

Action Report H—That the Assembly recommend the continuation of the Committee on Certification of Regional Accrediting Associations as a service committee of the SAA, that the committee have the same personnel including Chairman Karl Robinson, and that the committee be renamed the "Committee on Certification of Teachers of Speech." Approved

Action Report I—That the SAA appoint a committee to study the ethics of communication and develop a code. Not reported out ol committee.

Action Report J—That the SAA recommend that the Interest Group in Radio, Television, and Film report at the 1961 convention concerning the present and the potential effects of the use of television in instruction on the position of the teacher. Approved.

Action Report K—That the Assembly delegate to the American Forensic Association the authority to set up a committee to choose the national high school debate question for 1962-1963 and thereafter. No action was taken, but a substitute (see A.R.Q.) was approved.

Action Report L—That the SAA offer felicitations to the National University Extension Association on the work of the Committee on Discussion and Debate Materials and Interstate Cooperation and that SAA express appreciation to six designated agencies and individuals for their financial support of the activities of this committee. Not reported out of committee.

Action Report M—That the Executive Vice-President petition the President of the United States and the Congress for nonpartisan encouragement and financial support for programs of study, research, and training in the humanities and the social sciences and that this petition emphasize the need to include in such programs a study of the nature and the role of all forms of communication in a free society. Approved.

Action Report N—That emeritus membership be granted to Giles W. Gray. Approved.

Action Report O—That emeritus membership be granted to Gladys Whitman. Approved.

Action Report P—That the SAA establish a "Permanent Home Committee" with Dean James H. McBurney as chairman and that the committee report to the Assembly and the Administrative Council not later than December, 1961, concerning the feasibility of establishing a permanent national office in Washington, D. C., with a permanent staff. Aprroved.

Action Report Q—That a study committee

report to the Executive Committee of the Assembly at the 1961 convention regarding the advisability of delegating to the American Forensic Association the authority to provide for a committee to select the national high school debate question. Approved.

Action Report R—That the Assembly strongly disapprove of the affidavit of disbelief requirement of the National Defense Education Act, that the Assembly urge Congress to repeal this requirement immediately, and that the proper SAA officers be instructed to express these views to the Chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, the Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Education, and the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Education. Approved.

Action Report S—That the Committee on Certification of Teachers of Speech report at the 1961 convention concerning a proposal that the Assembly endorse a policy statement prepared by the interest groups in Speech in the Elementary Schools and Speech in the Secondary Schools.

Braden, as Second Vice-President, reported concerning the status of the recommendations, requests, and directives approved by the 1959 Legislative Assembly and Executive Committee through motions and action reports.

The Assembly approved and referred to the Committee on the Certification of Teachers of Speech the following recommendations of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Certification of the Regional Accrediting Associations: (1) that the work of the committee be continued or that a standing committee on certification of teachers of speech be established; (2) that this committee and the Executive Vice-President continue to contact the state departments and that they urge state and regional associations to take direct, strong action; (3) that they work with the regional accrediting organizations to raise standards; and (4) that they prepare a brochure stressing career opportunities, standards, certification requirements, etc., for distribution.

Wallace moved that the Assembly ask the Administrative Council to take the steps necessary to secure prompt consideration of increased membership dues—the increase to be of a significant amount. Seconded. Carried.

The Assembly endorsed the recommendation that interest groups continue to consider the possibility of requiring convention participants to prepare abstracts or outlines in advance.

The Assembly referred to the Executive Vice-President the suggestion that the SAA be represented on the Council on National Organizations for Children and Youth.

WAYNE N. THOMPSON
Clerk

EXCERPTS FROM THE REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

The Executive Secretary reported the office arrived in Bloomington, Ind. from Baton Rouge, La., on two trucks with a total weight shipped of 22,000 pounds, and a total moving cost of $1,857.66. For the fiscal year ending May 31, 1960, the Association showed a handsome total income of $79,163.25. Expenditures were $71,014.03, leaving a net income of $8,149.22.

As of December 10, 1960, the membership in the Association stood at 7,566. For purposes of comparison, membership statistics are included from the Executive Secretary's last membership report in 1959.

	1959	1960	Increase (Decrease)
Members who take *QJS* only	2,182	2,050	(132)
Members who take *ST* only	1,451	1,464	14
Members who take *SM* only	0	23	23
Subscribers to two journals	505		
ST & *QJS*		463	
SM & *QJS*		178	
SM & *ST*		28	164
Subscribers to three journals	268	231	(37)
Libraries taking *QJS*	1,493	1,277	(216)
Libraries taking *ST*	599	699	100
Libraries taking *SM*	616	460	(156)
Sustaining Members	617	692	75
TOTALS	7,731	7,566	(165)

There are 932 active members of the Teacher Placement Service.

BUDGETS SUBMITTED BY FINANCE COMMITTEE AND APPROVED BY ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL AND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AT THE 1960 CONVENTION

Publications:

	Revised Budget '60-'61	Tentative Budget '61-'62
QJS	$14,500.00	$15,000.00
Speech Monographs	6,200.00	6,000.00
Speech Teacher	9,000.00	9,500.00
Annual *Directory*	5,500.00	5,500.00
Special Printing	1,000.00	300.00
Purchase of Old Copies	650.00	650.00

Printing and Mimeographing:		
Stationery	1,200.00	1,200.00
New Solicitations	1,120.00	1,000.00
Renewals	560.00	560.00
Placement	1,000.00	1,000.00
Convention	3,000.00	3,000.00
Personnel:		
Officers and Committees	1,750.00	1,750.00
Secretary and Clerical	26,500.00	25,000.00
Dues:		
American Council on Education	300.00	300.00
National Education Association	220.00	220.00
Commissions and Discounts	2,750.00	2,750.00
Bank Charges	50.00	50.00
Secretary's Bond and Audit	562.50	600.00
Other Expenses:		
Postage and Distribution	5,600.00	5,000.00
Binding	600.00	700.00
Telephone and Telegraph	450.00	400.00
Insurance	253.75	260.00
Convention Expenses	2,500.00	2,500.00
Depreciation	1,000.00	1,000.00
Provision for Doubtful Accounts	500.00	500.00
Office Supplies and Service	1,800.00	1,800.00
Rent for National Office	2,400.00	2,400.00
	$90,966.25	$88,880.00
RESERVE FUND FOR PERM. HEADQUARTERS	$ 3,000.00*	$ 3,000.00*
REPLACEMENT OF OLD AND PURCHASE OF NEW EQUIPMENT	800.00	800.00
PURCHASE CAR LOAD OF PAPER	3,500.00	3,500.00
EXPENSE OF MOVING NATIONAL OFFICE	1,857.66	0

*The Executive Secretary is obligated to meet this reserve (by action of the Finance Committee).

REPORT ON ELECTION OF 1960 NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Results of the voting for the nominees to the Nominating Committee were as follows: total votes cast, 815; total number of persons receiving votes, 375. The twelve persons receiving the most votes were: A. Craig Baird, Lionel G. Crocker, John E. Dietrich, Donald H. Ecroyd, Marvin L. Esch, Wilbur E. Gilman, Orville A. Hitchcock, Glen E. Mills, Wayne C. Minnick, William M. Sattler, Donald K. Smith, and Karl R. Wallace.

On the second ballot, 1100 valid votes were cast. In tabulating the vote by the Hare system of proportional representation, the following three persons were elected: Lionel G. Crocker, John E. Dietrich, and Karl R. Wallace.

At the 1960 convention, the Administrative Council selected Elizabeth Carr, and the Legislative Assembly selected Mary Louise Gehring to complete the committee. Miss Gehring was elected chairman by the committee.

REPORT OF THE 1960 NOMINATING COMMITTEE

NOMINEES FOR SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT

Carroll Arnold, Cornell Univ.
Robert T. Oliver, Pennsylvania State Univ.

NOMINEES FOR ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL

Wilma Grimes, Univ. of Washington
Frederick Haberman, Univ. of Wisconsin
John Highlander, Ohio Univ.
Freda Kenner, Messick High School, Memphis
Jack Matthews, Univ. of Pittsburgh
Mardel Ogilvie, Queens College

NOMINEES FOR LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY:
GEOGRAPHIC AREA

CENTRAL AREA

G. Bradford Barber, Illinois State Normal Univ.
William Conboy, Univ. of Kansas
Robert S. Goyer, Purdue Univ.
Ted R. Jackson, Wisconsin State College, Oshkosh
Lowell McCoy, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati
Robert L. Scott, Univ. of Minnesota
Donald Sikkink, South Dakota State Teachers College
Edward Stasheff, Univ. of Michigan

EASTERN AREA

Robert Carson, Hamilton College
Edmund Cortez, Univ. of New Hampshire
Wofford Gardner, Univ. of Maine
Arthur S. Hough, Jr., Wesleyan Univ., Conn.
Almon Ives, Dartmouth College
E. Winston Jones, Boston Univ.
Ellen Kauffman, Montclair State College, N. J.
Kathryn Mulholland, Brooklyn College

SOUTHERN AREA

Allen Bales, Univ. of Alabama
M. Blair Hart, Univ. of Arkansas
DeWitte T. Holland, Hardin-Simmons Univ.
Robert L. McCroskey, Emory Univ.
Francine Merritt, Louisiana State Univ.
Louis Hall Swain, North Carolina State College

Roy Tew, Univ. of Florida
G. Allan Yeomans, Howard College, Alabama

WESTERN AREA

Kenneth Berger, Sacramento, Calif.
Donald Klopf, Univ. of Hawaii
Henrietta Krantz, Alaska Div. of Health, Juneau, Alaska
Oliver W. Nelson, Univ. of Washington
Howard Runion, College of the Pacific
James Stansell, Los Angeles State College
George K. Sparks, Univ. of Arizona
D. Glenn Starlin, Univ. of Oregon

NOMINEES FOR LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY:
MEMBERS-AT-LARGE

Raymond S. Beard, State Univ. College of Educ., Cortland, N. Y.
Winton Beaven, Washington Missionary College, Takoma Park, Md.
Gifford Blyton, Univ. of Kentucky
William Bos, Eastern Michigan College
Martin Bryan, Univ. of Cincinnati
John A. Burgess, Bennington, Vt.
Charlotte Cleeland, Idaho State College, Pocatello
Martin T. Cobin, Univ. of Illinois
Rupert Cortright, Wayne State Univ.
Agnes G. Doody, Univ. of Rhode Island
Christine Drake, Univ. of Mississippi
Donald Ecroyd, Michigan State Univ.
Turner W. Edge, Univ. of Delaware
Novalyn Price Ellis (Mrs. William), Lafayette Senior H. S., Lafayette, La.
Richard Fallon, Florida State Univ.
Seth Fessenden, Orange Co. State College, Fullerton, Calif.
Iline Fife, Pennsylvania State Univ.
Wallace Fotheringham, Ohio State Univ.
Robert P. Friedman, Univ. of Missouri
Frank Funk, Syracuse Univ.
G. B. Gordon, Pacific Bible Seminary
Robert Haakenson, Smith, Kline and French Lab., Philadelphia
Harold O. Haskitt, General Motors Institute, Flint, Mich.
S. I. Hayakawa, San Francisco State College
Reginald V. Holland, North Texas State College
Mildred Ibberson, Florida Southern College
Charles R. Irwin, Baldwin-Wallace College
Manuel Irwin Kuhr, Temple Univ.
Rev. J. Edward Lantz, Exec. Dir. Southern Office, Natl. Council of Churches of Christ, Atlanta, Ga.
Mary E. Latimer, Madison College, Harrisonburg, Va.
Leroy Lewis, Ed. Dir., Am. Inst. of Banking, New York City
Patricia McIlrath, Univ. of Kansas City
Katherine B. McFarland, Stroudsburg State Teachers College, Pa.
Allen McLeod, State Univ. College of Educ., Fredonia, N. Y.
Joseph H. Mahaffey, Air Univ., Maxwell Field, Alabama
Marguerite P. Metcalf, Hall H. S., Little Rock, Ark.
Roger E. Nebergall, Univ. of Oklahoma
Roy Nelson, Colorado State Univ.
Ira North, David Lipscomb College
Joseph O'Rourke, Wabash College
William H. Olson, Bradford, Pa.
Upton Palmer, Univ. of California, Santa Barbara
James W. Parkerson, Northeast State College, Monroe, La.
Waldo Phelps, Univ. of California, Los Angeles
Edyth M. Renshaw, Southern Methodist Univ.
John T. Rickey, Purdue Univ.
David B. Strother, Univ. of Washington
Harold Svanoe, Luther College
William S. Tacey, Univ. of Pittsburgh
Gordon Thomas, Michigan St. Univ.
Donald Torrence, Knox College
Sylvester Toussaint, Colorado State College of Educ.
Evan Ulrey, Harding College, Searcy, Ark.
Wm. S. Vanderpool, Grinnell College
Alban F. Varnado, Louisiana State Univ., New Orleans
Unalee Voight, Enid H. S., Enid, Okla.
Charles Weniger, Seventh Day Adventist Seminary, Washington, D. C.
Edna West, Northwestern State College, Natchitoches, La.
Garff B. Wilson, Univ. of California, Berkeley
George P. Wilson, Jr., Univ. of Virginia

MARY LOUISE GEHRING
Chairman

LISTENING OR AGREEING

To the Editor:

Most speech teachers have heard a sufficient number of talks on the subject of conformity to be convinced that students are interested in the subject. In addition, there is abundant evidence indicating that Americans are organization-minded people considerably caught

up in what W. S. Whyte called the "social ethic." In an effort to determine to what extent the tendency toward herd behavior influences the act of speech criticism, the writer conducted a pilot study.

The experimentees were undergraduate students from three beginning speech classes at the University of Washington during the fall quarter of 1960. The same seven-minute tape recorded student speech was played to each class. Oral criticism was called for, but no comments were made by the instructor. When all persons had been given the opportunity to vent their remarks, the instructor called upon everyone to grade the speech. Each grade was written on the blackboard. During individual student conferences, half of the students in each of the classes had previously been asked to work secretly with the instructor in the experiment. All the cooperating subjects in class x were requested to praise the speech enthusiastically and in a specific manner. Also each of these students was assigned a high grade between A and B to give to the speech at the appropriate time. In classes y and z the cooperating students were requested to deprecate the speech strongly during the oral criticism period and to designate to it a grade of between C— and D—. The purpose of the study was to determine whether the naive subjects in each class would be influenced by the artificial criticism and grades which had been prearranged with half of their classmates. All three classes were those of the writer and had been exposed to the process of oral criticism, having engaged in it daily after every student speech for a period of six weeks.

In class x, the positively oriented group, the experimentees offered the following grades to the recorded speech: A— A— B+ B *B* B B B— B— (not in this crder). In classes y and z, the negatively oriented groups, the grades were A— B+ B B B B— *C* C C C C— C— D. The median grade in each group is italicized, *B* for class x, and *C* for classes y and z. Of course, the number of subjects involved in this limited study is small and precludes a significant conclusion. The results, however, would tend to suggest that undergraduate speech students at the University of Washington might be destined to be typical organization personnel in the true W. S. Whyte sense of the term.

WALTER W. STEVENS
University of Washington

FEDERAL AID TO HIGHER EDUCATION

To the Editor:

At the Saint Louis convention, the Legislative Assembly of SAA passed Action Report R, introduced by Frederick Haberman, urging Congress to repeal the "affidavit of disbelief" requirement of the National Defense Education Act. It also passed Action Report M, introduced by Thorrel B. Fest, petitioning the President and Congress to provide "financial support for undergraduate, graduate, and special programs of study, research, and training in the humanities and social science" and "to include in such programs study of the nature and role of all forms of communication in a free society."

As a constituent member of the American Council of Education, the Speech Association, through its retiring Executive Vice-President, J. Jeffery Auer, participated in the formulation of "A Proposed Program of Federal Action to Strengthen Higher Education." The sections of most concern to SAA members are:

Title II. National Defense Student Loan Program

1. Remove the present $250,000 ceiling on

the Federal capital contribution which may be made in one year to any one institution participating in the Student Loan Program.

2. Extend the teacher forgiveness feature in the loan program to include non-public school teachers.

3. Extend the teacher forgiveness feature in the loan program to include college teachers.

4. Retain capital funds deposited by the Federal Government in the institutions as a revolving fund, with appropriate provisions for replenishing the funds to meet the needs of increasing enrollments and the depletion caused by the forgiveness feature.

5. Authorize the Commissioner to assist the institutions in meeting the administrative costs of operating National Defense Student Loan Funds.

6. Require a minimum repayment each year by borrowers from Student Loan Funds. (It has been suggested that, in order to expedite collection of relatively small loans, it would be desirable to provide that a minimum annual repayment of $50 plus interest may be required by the lending institution.)

Title IV. National Defense Fellowships

1. Provide that the Commissioner may appoint a replacement to complete the term of a fellowship which is vacated by a student who does not complete the prescribed tenure of an award made under the Graduate Fellowship Program.

2. Provide an appropriate fixed amount as the annual institutional payment for each fellow, rather than a payment based on actual computed costs as at present.

3. Endeavor to upgrade the quality of present college faculty by a fellowship program which would enable people now teaching to take one year off from their teaching duties and devote full time to completion of their doctor's degree.

4. Make available a supplemental program of fellowships under NDEA which does not require new teaching personnel or expanded facilities as at present.

5. Coordinate the NDEA fellowship program with programs of other Federal agencies to the end that the total Government program may conform, at least roughly, to the traditional pattern of relative emphasis of disciplines in the colleges and universities.

Title X. Miscellaneous Provisions

1. Eliminate the requirement for a student disclaimer affidavit. The committee by unanimous vote approved a new title in the NDEA as follows:

1. A Federal Scholarship Program.
   a. The Committee recommends an appropriation of $25 million for scholarships the first year, with the annual total rising to $100 million in the fourth year. These sums would provide a minimum of 25,000 new scholarships each year, with an eventual total of 100,000 scholarships.
   b. Stipends should be variable according to student need, with a maximum annual stipend of $1,000.
   c. Scholarships should be awarded by the institutions themselves, using funds allocated in approximately the same manner as Federal Student Loan Funds.
   d. For each scholarship student enrolled, the educational institution should receive a cost-of-education grant.

In a separate action, the Council's Committee on Television made a recommendation concerning Title VII of the National Defense Education Act. This committee is in favor of maintaining at least the present level of support for research and experimentation in the use of the mass media for education. If the level of support could be increased considerably, more institutions would be encouraged to engage in studies and experimentation.

It is felt that there should be a greater variety of research projects, with a concentrated attack on some problems that could be identified at the national level. From limited observation, it seems that there has been an inconsistency in the granting of funds with little reference to the over-all national objectives.

In January, 1961, the American Council of Learned Societies warned that the present priorities of the NDEA "may create a dangerous imbalance in the curriculum" and urged an extension of fellowship grants in all fields.

SAA members who wish to support the position of these three scholarly organizations are urged to express their opinions to their respective senators and representatives.

ROBERT G. GUNDERSON
Executive Vice-President, SAA

FREE SPEECH AND THE SPEECH ASSOCIATION

To the Editor:

This is an open letter to the Speech Association of America.

Those of us whose signatures appear below believe that the Speech Association of America has seemed curiously unconcerned with the foundation upon which it stands—the Freedom of Speech. This is not to say that as individuals our colleagues are not convinced of its importance; it is to say that the Association has not provided an adequate forum in which freedom of speech might be examined, threats to this freedom discussed, and scholarly studies sponsored.

"Freedom of speech has become a central concern of the Western Society . . . ," states Walter Lippman. "The right to speak freely is one of the necessary means to the attainment of the truth. That, and not the subjective pleasure of utterance, is why freedom is a necessity in the good society" (*Public Philosophy*).

What is necessary for the society as a whole is basic to the entire professional life of the teacher of speech. The unrestricted access to information, the right to open discussion on any issue, the freedom to select and present material of artistic merit—these rights are indispensable for the teacher of public address, radio-television, interpretation, or drama. As teachers, we may not feel that our freedom is now curtailed, but whatever restricts even one of us today may tomorrow bind us all. And beyond our classrooms, wherever in American society some part of the market place of ideas is closed down, the art of discourse is thereby endangered.

If teachers of speech accept this basic position, and we believe they do, does it not follow that the Speech Association should adopt freedom of speech as a basic concern? Regardless of the differing political viewpoints of our members, this is a principle we can all support.

We do not mean to imply that the Association has said nothing about this freedom. In 1952 the Association passed a resolution which condemned "the increasing pressures which tend to intimidate free expression of convictions," and reaffirmed "our belief in the processes of free debate and discussion and our belief that the United States of America stands in present danger from the suppression of free speech. . . ." Beyond such expression of support, and a handful of articles in our journals over the years, the organization has done little. And the danger is still present.

It is our conviction that the Speech Association should examine these problems of freedom of speech in a general session at its annual convention, and that *QJS* should regularly provide space for reporting such problems. Further, we believe that this is an important area of scholarly research and publication in speech. Finally, we hope that a mechanism will ultimately be established within the Association which would allow the membership to act on specific issues which might arise.

An interest group has offered to sponsor a program on freedom of speech at the 1961 convention, but we believe that this should not be an interest of one group, but a concern of the entire Association. For this reason we address this letter to all members. We ask whether you believe the SAA should be more deeply concerned with the freedom of speech. We hope you will send your reactions to The Forum of *QJS* where they may appear as space allows. This ought to indicate whether members believe the SAA should take a more active role in examining, discussing,

and disseminating information on this fundamental freedom.

HERMAN COHEN
University of Oregon
LLOYD E. CRISP
San Francisco State College
ALVIN GOLDBERG
Northern Illinois University
FRANKLYN HAIMAN
Northwestern University
ARTHUR HOUGH
Wesleyan University, Connecticut
MARK S. KLYN
University of California, Berkeley
STANLEY F. PAULSON
San Francisco State College
EUGENE REBSTOCK
San Francisco State College
WALTER SIMONSON
Mississippi Southern College

SAA CONVENTIONS

To the Editor:

Amen!

What else can be said to the Hastings and Berquist and McLaughlin letters which appeared in The Forum of the February, 1961, *QJS*?

The awful (in the original sense of the term) part is the public silence of the other 1,223 members who attended the St. Louis SAA convention in December, even though the volume and number of adverse comments heard around hotel corridors has been growing each year.

We're afraid that complaints and a few letters aren't going to alter the situation in SAA, especially when the "gripers" are a part of the system they are attacking and must be tarred with the same brush. Life in the Groves of Academe is difficult enough without putting the knife to one's own throat. All the greater reason to applaud what little criticism has been attempted.

With the rising tide of beneath-the-surface criticism, however, something is going to change, and what does happen is of vital concern to all of us in the profession. Not long ago ASHA separated (and now has a larger national convention), and AETA was not far behind. The natural question is, Who's next? Corridor rumors are that another allied group is ready to leave but is filling out a ten-year commitment made by an over-eager representative several years back. Where does the exodus stop?

Individuals, as well as organized groups, have begun to defect to what they believe to be more promising or more professional societies. The problem is made more serious by the Parkinsonian natural law which states that as such fractionation proceeds the "quality" membership will be gradually forced out.

Even the more myopic must be able to see what is happening; in fact the reorganization of some years ago may indicate some recognition of a problem of considerable dimensions. The nearly universal tendency to "bear those ills we have," however, makes it difficult to accept surgery until the case is recognized as desperate. Unless and until the "Powers-That-Be" can be shown in unequivocal terms that slow strangulation is taking place, those of us who are concerned may as well save our wind, postage, and paper. We will be tolerated—because of the essential fair-mindedness of the "Powers"—but ultimately given the coup de grâce—"for the good of the organization"—with such finesse that no external wound will be apparent.

Both writers are aware that the most heinous crimes are those which one has lately vowed not to commit (again), and neither of us is particularly proud of his own role during the past few years. One of us dropped his member-

ship almost ten years ago; the other maintained his role as an organization man helping perpetuate the same programs year after year. Upon returning from St. Louis we reached a decision: withdrawal and three years of griping had accomplished nothing, so we attempted to develop a "battle-plan." Our "battle-plan" is a ten-year study of the relative professional status and contributions of the SAA, its conventions, its programs, and its publications.

FIRST, a comparative study of the sectional program structure of SAA conventions for the past ten years has been undertaken. For each year and for each section information as to the number of participants, the type of participation (panel, paper, demonstration, etc.) and eight other items will be studied. Linear comparisons of SAA programs and particular interest groups within them are planned to cover both the entire ten-year period and the 1958-59-60 era.

SECOND, a comparative and analytic study of the individuals and their contributions for the same ten-year and three-year periods has been initiated. This will require the completion of more than three thousand index cards (some seven hundred have already been completed) showing sponsors, chairmen, participants, duplicate appearances, types of presentations, title comparisons, and geographic and institutional relationships.

THIRD, thirty-three different professional organizations are being polled to determine their methods and requirements for selecting papers for national conventions. Some of these convention programs are being analyzed as described above. These organizations range from "hard" sciences (physics, chemistry, etc.) to humanities (modern languages, English, classics, etc.). More than half of those contacted have already replied. An analysis of these data should help establish just how we fit, with our present structure, into the academic professional hierarchy.

FOURTH, a study of professional contribution of publications by SAA has been undertaken, using the criterion of re-use developed in the journal of the American Association for Advancement of Science.

FINALLY, an offshoot study has been started which involves the analysis of information obtained by questionnaires dealing with institutional regulations covering travel requirements and financial aid for attendance at national conventions. These results should shed some light on the problem of size, membership and necessity for operation of the SAA convention under its present structure.

This is the "battle-plan." Frankly, it frightens us. Our estimate, based upon what has already been done, is twelve to eighteen months to completion. We hope that small, independent units may be finished sooner. If our theory is correct and what we need is factual data to support criticisms and improvements of SAA, these data may help.

Under any circumstances they should trigger a king-size explosion.

CHARLES GOETZINGER
University of Colorado
MILT VALENTINE
University of Colorado

NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW

ROBERT G. GUNDERSON, *Editor*

RECORDINGS OF THE SPOKEN WORD

William B. McCoard

Most of us are somewhat aware of the plethora of phonograph records of reading and speaking. Those of us who have had high hopes for the "new" audio libraries have quietly cheered the efforts of Linguaphone, The Harvard Vocarium, The Library of Congress, The National Council of Teachers of English, and others who have pioneered in recording the spoken word. Now we have reason to pay attention to Caedmon Publishers, whose recordings have become surprisingly successful commercially as well as artistically. A sampling of their recordings is offered in this review.

Poets Reading Their Own Poems

Caedmon has five volumes of Dylan Thomas plus *Under Milk Wood* with Thomas as the narrator. Thomas has been a consistent best-seller among the "pressed poets." Volume I is said to have brought in around $1,000,000. Thomas is an exciting lyric poet who reads excitingly. His recordings are such that a listener can be moved without feeling a need to make logical sense of each line. In the first volume he seems relaxed, quiet, intimate, without the actor's performance of his later recordings. Volume IV begins with his "Visit to America," a brash, audience-mocking attack. This is followed by readings of poems by other poets, done in the tumult-ringing style that makes de la Mare, Auden, Hardy, and others all sound like Dylan Thomas. Volume V offers prose stories of his childhood in Wales. *Under Milk Wood* is excellent. Thomas loves the words and the rhythms and the other actors.

Robert Frost reads his poetry so that "the speaking tone of voice [is] somehow entangled in the words"—to quote Frost's statement of the essence of poetry. Frost deserves the title of America's most widely admired poet. Unfortunately, he has here recorded many of the poems he has recorded before, while many of his best poems remain unrecorded.

Walter de la Mare, Wallace Stevens, and Stephen Spender should prove to any doubting listener that poets are men—strong, powerful, masculine men. Walter de la Mare mutters and mumbles along in conversational patterns and makes the written word seem completely spontaneous. Fascinating as this technique is, complete naturalness is not always desirable; art by its very nature requires more than conversation. (Incidentally, the first two selections *are* actual conversations which are charming partially because there seems to be no reason to record such things.) Wallace Stevens is a cultured, cultivated, mature man who has lived intensely. His way of reading is a sort of sad chant plus

Mr. McCoard is Professor of Speech, University of Southern California.

song. Stephen Spender seems to be confessing, yet uses an overly distinct and precise manner of speaking as though he were training for the stage. He is an exciting personality, but he reads with a sameness of style like nearly all authors who have not learned to project in the spoken word the variety they give to the world in their written words.

Actors Reading Poetry

James Mason reads selections from the poetry of Robert Browning: "The Bishop Orders His Tomb," "Andrea Del Sarto," and "Fra Lippo Lippi." Mr. Mason gets from this hearer a heartfelt bravo! He reads *different materials differently*. He establishes characters that are widely divergent one from the other. This is highly effective oral interpretation.

Sir Cedric Hardwicke and Robert Newton read *17th Century Poetry*, including metaphysical and love lyrics of Herbert, Marvell, Vaughan, Traherne, Cowley, and others. Sir Cedric is a consummate interpretative artist. His cleanly delivered speech flows as smoothly as oil, or explodes like rockets when necessary. He illuminates every word he reads. Robert Newton seems too dramatic for this material. He projects to the balcony material that should be offered to, but not forced upon, the hearer. By establishing so dynamic a pattern, he leaves little room to build thereon. At worst, he is a skillful professional ham.

The Poetry of Shelley read by Vincent Price might be outstanding were it not for Mr. Price's tendency to murmur and coo the words.

The Poetry of Tennyson read by Dame Sybil Thorndike and Sir Lewis Casson demonstrates that actors are excellent in narrative materials and less effective in lyric. Casson's reading of "Ulysses" is the best we have ever heard if one accepts the poem as a dramatic monologue in which the character study is of major importance. Casson creates an absorbing picture—even the actor's trilled r's add to the elevation of the heroic character. Dame Sybil Thorndike is excellent also. The lines are so elegantly read that an American's ear might be distracted by the aristocracy of the king's English.

Presented as a tender colloquy between King Solomon and his bride, the *Song of Songs* becomes an unusually beautiful dramatic lyric. Claire Bloom makes the bride exultant, exciting, elevated. Claude Rains is less exciting to this reviewer, but perhaps this is to be expected. These lyrics do very well with a dramatic treatment. Side 2 presents *The Letters of Heloise and Abelard*. The Text says: "These letters of the bitterness of love thwarted and betrayed are authentic as the two people from whose tormented lives they are wrung." The letters are well read; the simplicity is admirable. They may be more listenable when one is alone than when one is in a classroom.

One of the finest spoken records we have heard is Judith Anderson reading the Book of Judith and Claire Bloom reading the Book of Ruth. Miss Anderson reads with insight, sensitivity, and tremendous emotional impact, material that is far from easy, indeed that would be impossible for most readers. Miss Bloom has an enchanting grown-up-little-girl quality that leaves one unprepared for the strength and vigor of her reading.

In *The Poetry of Byron* Tyrone Power reads Canto I of "Don Juan," "She Walks in Beauty," "On This Day I Complete My 36th Year," and excerpts from "Childe Harold's Pilgrimmage." For one who has under-played his way to lasting motion picture fame, Mr.

Power does a surprisingly good job. He very often fails to supply the subtle meanings of the material, but the more obvious values are well performed.

The Rubaiyat, read by Alfred Drake, presents this popular musical comedy star laboring mightily at precise articulation with rather disastrous effects upon the emotional content of the material. His voice is striking, but one can hear what he is saying only with much difficulty.

Lewis Carroll's *The Hunting of the Snark* and Robert Browning's *The Pied Piper* receive the full treatment of Boris Karloff. Shades of Karloff's other characters haunt the listener, but lovers of these selections will not mind. Karloff is a better reader than one is likely to hear every day.

It is something special to have "Medea" come down to reading Robert Louis Stevenson's *A Child's Garden of Verses,* but Judith Anderson does this rather successfully. However, her powerful, rich, varied voice seems somewhat wasted in this garden. What makes this listener feel she never read these selections to children—at least her own? The children we have read to like a slower tempo and less "technique."

A highlight of recorded poetry is the work done by Claire Bloom, Eric Portman, and John Neville reading a selection from Palgrave's *Golden Treasury.* Perhaps because there are three readers, these poems do not suffer so much from the poem-after-a-poem-after-a-poem method as do most anthologies. These readers all read as actors, but they are good. They make sense. They are not afraid to emphasize the rhymes and rhythms—yet remain natural. They are intimate, yet elevated emotionally. This reviewer likes their dramatic-lyric contradiction. Each selection is read as though it were a speech from a play in which the character has a moment of lyric intensity. The microphone is so well used that one heart speaks to one ear; this must be the ultimate essence of lyricism. No recording is perfect, but these readers seem more appropriate, respectful, and spontaneous than one expects actors to be. Of the three readers, Portman seems the least effective—sometimes he drops support at the ends of lines, and his intelligibility level is lower. These are minor matters, though. This is a "Golden Treasury" for those who treasure the golden past in English poetry.

Readings of Prose

One of the truly outstanding contributions is the five-volume *Cambridge Treasury of English Prose.* The recordings were made at Cambridge by members of the University under the direction of George Rylands, Fellow of Kings College. These men and women read with a personal quality as though for a single individual. There is no lecturing; they are quiet and contemplative, yet strong; they are intelligent, appreciative, interested in sharing, not showing off; there is freedom from affectation (with one exception who sounds like Vincent Price); there is intensity, sincerity, authority. One wonders why the readers' names were not given. Something makes one wonder if they really are teachers, for they have the sound of professional performers—at least we have few such rich, resonant, distinct, professional speakers on "Amurrican" campuses. The volumes are arranged as follows: Volume I, *Malory to Donne;* Volume II, *Burton to Johnson;* Volume III, *Defoe to Burke;* Volume IV, *Austen to Brontë;* Volume V, *Dickens to Butler.* It is an unusual experience to hear prose selections read "straight" for the pleasure and beauty that lie in prose.

Other prose recordings that have come to our attention include *Stories of Mark Twain* with Walter Brennan and Brandon de Wilde. Hal Holbrook's Mark Twain has set up an image of Twain's tempo, timing, and manner so that this interpretation seems rushed and not very amusing. Included are "The Jumping Frog of Calaveras County," two episodes from *Huckleberry Finn,* and Jim Baker's Bluejay Yarn from *A Tramp Abroad.*

The Red Badge of Courage, read by Edmond O'Brien, is only a fair job (handicapped by an overly loud sound track). Mr. O'Brien "acts" when reading dialogue, but too often he simply makes resonant sounds when reading descriptive passages. The difference is often disconcerting.

In *Frank O'Connor Reading Two Complete Stories* ("The Drunkard" and "My Oedipus Complex"), a strong and not particularly attractive nasality handicaps Mr. O'Connor. The material, while often interesting, is rarely dramatic; this demands a great deal of the reader if boredom is to be avoided. Mr. O'Connor, an intelligent reader, does not seem to be artist enough to bring this material to life.

In *Peter Marshall Speaks* Mr. Marshall delivers two sermons and, in terms of public speaking techniques, delivers them very effectively. To American ears, the slight Scotch brogue should be delightful. Diction, voice, and interpretation are excellent. Content-wise, the sermons seem more like interesting stories than sermons—at least to this listener.

Drama

Another unlooked for and therefore doubly pleasing series is the four-volume drama anthology, *Monuments of Early English Drama,* directed by Howard O. Sackler. The first volume, *The Wellsprings of Drama,* includes *Quem Quaeritis* (Latin), *Banns* (Middle English), and the Modern English performances of the Middle English plays *The Deluge, Noah's Children, Robin Hood and the Friar,* and *Abraham and Isaac.* Plays which foreshadow the greater achievements of Renaissance drama in English are Volume II, *Everyman* starring Burgess Meredith; and Volume III, *Great Comedies,* including *The Second Shepherd's Play, Gamma Gurton's Needle, Ralph Roister Doister,* and *The Merry Play.* Volume IV stars Frank Silvera in Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus.*

The Merchant of Venice and *Oedipus Rex* are very special offerings of Caedmon. Michael Redgrave as Shylock is provocative since he attempts to rescue the character from the nineteenth-century tragic stature with which the great actors chose to "beef up" the part. Redgrave comes closer to the Elizabethan figure of the vulgar, vengeful Jew as he plays his ducats and his daughter for comedy. Shylock here is plainly the villain, not a persecuted, sympathetic character. The entire cast gives a lucid, effective interpretation. However, there are a number of aspects that make this seem more reading than performance: There is no attempt to recreate the bustle and noise of the Rialto; the dialects are inconsistent since Shylock speaks with a realistic Jewish dialect, Gobbo speaks in the fool's conventional Cockney, and the Prince of Morocco and the Prince of Arragon, who are the most foreign, utter lines in admirable stage diction. This, then, is not high drama even though it is good listening. *Oedipus Rex* demonstrates that it is possible for a recording made from the sound track of a movie to be more successful in communicating the drama than is the movie itself. Tyrone Guthrie's motion picture of Sophocles' drama received scant notice, while the record-

ing seems deeply moving. Is it possible that the masks and properties provided too great a visual puzzle for the moviegoer? In any event, the recording affords a truly magnificent experience in classic tragedy. The inexorable and grisly revelation moves in overpowering rhythms. Donald Campbell, of the Stratford Ontario Players, presents an Oedipus whose rages are towering, whose agony is monumental. Once or twice the choruses achieve superbly musical lyric reading without resorting to chant. Such moving high tragedy is a rare experience.

Authors who read scenes from their own plays are not a rarity, but rare is the playwright whose reading adds much! Caedmon presents Sean O'Casey reading from *Juno and the Paycock, Pictures in the Hallway,* and *Inishfallen, Fare Thee Well.* Mr. O'Casey is not a great interpreter. His brogue lends authenticity to the material, but the readings need much more variety if the old bugaboo, monotony, is to be avoided. Another playwright-reader is Tennessee Williams reading from *The Glass Menagerie* and *The Yellow Bird* (as well as various poems). Mr. Williams leaves a great deal to be desired as a reader. His speech is not overly distinct or clear; he drones his way through the material, lisping consistently as he goes.

The three major scenes of *The Barretts of Wimpole Street* are presented by Katherine Cornell, of course, and Anthony Quayle. The approach is familiar. Of greater interest are the twenty *Sonnets From the Portuguese* read by Miss Cornell on the opposite side of the disc. These are simply, gently, intelligently read as though spoken by Miss Cornell as E.B.B., yet somehow they seem to lack the emotional believability that is the essence of a sonnet.

In their "Recordings of the Spoken Word" Caedmon has won an impressive popularity and prestige. These reviews illustrate the breadth and quality of their offerings. It is up to us as educators to learn to use these records meaningfully. It took over a hundred and fifty years to learn to use the printing press; with patience, intelligence, and hope, recorded libraries may yield their fruits before so many years elapse.

CAEDMON RECORDS REVIEWED

Unless otherwise specified, each item consists of one 12" record at $5.95.

DYLAN THOMAS. Five volumes. TC1002, 1018, 1043, 1061, 1132; $5.95 each.

UNDER MILK WOOD. Dylan Thomas and the original cast. TC 2005, 2-12", $11.90.

ROBERT FROST. TC 1060.

WALTER DE LA MARE. TC 1046.

WALLACE STEVENS. TC 1068.

STEPHEN SPENDER. TC 1084.

THE POETRY OF BROWNING. Read by James Mason. TC 1048.

17th CENTURY POETRY. Read by Cedric Hardwicke and Robert Newton. TC 1049.

THE POETRY OF SHELLEY. Read by Vincent Price. TC 1059.

THE POETRY OF TENNYSON. Read by Dame Sybil Thorndike and Sir Lewis Casson. TC 1080.

THE SONG OF SONGS AND HELOISE AND ABELARD. Read by Claire Bloom and Claude Rains. TC 1085.

THE BOOK OF JUDITH AND THE BOOK OF RUTH. Read by Judith Anderson and Claire Bloom. TC 1052.

THE POETRY OF BYRON. Read by Tyrone Power. TC 1042.

THE RUBAIYAT. Read by Alfred Drake. TC 1023.

THE PIED PIPER AND THE HUNTING OF THE SNARK. Read by Boris Karloff. TC 1075.

A CHILD'S GARDEN OF VERSES. Read by Judith Anderson. TC 1077.

PALGRAVE'S GOLDEN TREASURY. Read by Claire Bloom, Eric Portman, and John Neville. TC 2011, 2-12", $11.90.

THE CAMBRIDGE TREASURY OF ENGLISH PROSE. Five volumes. Recorded at Cambridge University under the auspices of the British Council. TC 1054, with book, $8.50; TC 1055-1058, $5.95 each.

STORIES OF MARK TWAIN. Read by Brandon de Wilde and Walter Brennan. TC 1027.

THE RED BADGE OF COURAGE. Read by Edmond O'Brien. TC 1040.

FRANK O'CONNOR. TC 1036.

PETER MARSHALL SPEAKS. TCR 101. Printed text of sermons, $0.25.

MONUMENTS OF EARLY ENGLISH DRAMA. Four volumes. TC 1030-1033, $5.95 each.

THE MERCHANT OF VENICE. Michael Redgrave as Shylock. TC 2013.

OEDIPUS REX. Yeats translation. Douglas Campbell and the Stratford, Ontario, Shakespearean Festival Players. TC 2012, 2-12", $11.90.
SEAN O'CASEY. TC 1012.
TENNESSEE WILLIAMS. TC 1005.
THE BARRETTS OF WIMPOLE STREET AND SONNETS FROM THE PORTUGUESE. Read by Katharine Cornell and Anthony Quayle. TC 1071.

THE OPEN STAGE: AND THE MODERN THEATRE IN RESEARCH AND PRACTICE. By Richard Southern. New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1959; pp. 125. $3.00.

SHAKESPEARE'S WOODEN O. By Leslie Hotson. New York: Macmillan, 1960; pp. 335. $6.50.

SHAKESPEARE'S STAGE. By A. M. Nagler. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958; pp. 117. $2.00.

Southern's book consists of four lectures delivered in 1951-52. As often happens with lecture-derived books, this one seems thin in substance, loosely organized, and popular. Southern intended a modest introduction to a subject about which his experience as designer-director had caused him to speculate. The book is no more than that; it is chatty and piquant rather than witty and definitive. The "open stage" is a platform surrounded by audience on three sides. Southern rambles over architecture, acting, directing, dramaturgy, scenery, theatre history, and the audience-actor relationship in respect to the open stage. He begins by stating that the key to his lectures is "the wish to see the urgent figures of modern drama served by an adequate acting place." One approves his admiration for the open stage's possibilities for acting Shakespeare and Japanese *Noh*, particularly since his admiration comes from actual theatre work (though his air of discovery seems pretty overdone in 1961), but one feels anticlimax when it is finally revealed that the "urgent" dramas for which an "adequate acting place" is sought are Fry's *The Lady's Not for Burning* and Cocteau's *The Eagle Has Two Heads.*

Hotson's book provokes not conviction, but desire to have a *truly* thoughtful investigation of the questions raised: Was there a relation between pageant wagons and the Elizabethan stage? Were traps generally used for entrances? Where was the tiring-house in the Hope Theatre (Hotson misquotes the Hope contract)? Was "righteous heaven and sinister hell" a tradition on the Elizabethan stage? Was orientation a consideration in Elizabethan acting? What use of set pieces, tents, houses was made on the Elizabethan stage? Hotson, long known as an assiduous, inventive researcher, has composed a mere polemic. His thesis, first propounded in 1953, is that in Elizabethan theatres the stage was completely surrounded by spectators, that its sides were filled with "houses transparent," that the tiring-house—*beneath* the stage—was reached through trapdoors within the "houses transparent," and that the rear of the stage, the *mimorum aedes* of de Witt's drawing, housed merely affluent spectators and the "property dock." This thesis has been a tar-baby; the more Hotson has wrestled with it, the messier has become his presentation. His book is smeared with scholarship, with daubs of quotation, but this has had only external application. Metaphors are interpreted literally, simple statements figuratively. Ambiguities are regarded as clear proofs. Analogies are wrenched into service (e.g., why must Spanish and English pageants be the same?). The Elizabethan theatre lasted sixty-seven years, comprised twenty-one playhouses and hundreds of actors, playwrights, and businessmen. Hotson treats this complex institution as a simple entity without regard to chronology, to known diversity, or even to the most obvious evidence (such as the de Witt drawing). His extravagance fascinates; his learning sometimes intrigues (e.g., his discovery of a contemporary view of the first Fortune amazes and convinces), but his book is tedious in its contentiousness and potentially mischievous for the unwary.

Nagler describes "the 'ideal type' of the Shakespearean stage." No better brief introduction to its subject now exists. The book is compact, judicious, clear, simple without condescension, learned and thoughtful, lively and readable. It offers pithy chapters on public and private theatres, on court performances and masques, on actors and acting, costumes, "stage management," and audience. It reconstructs *Romeo and Juliet* at The Theatre and *The Tempest* at the second Blackfriars. It deals with the stage-forms of sixteenth-century Europe as prelude to sensible discussion of the probable form of Shakespeare's stage. My students have read the book and been not merely informed, but excited about the subject. For them Nagler has provided a helpful reading list.

ROBERT H. HETHMON
University of Wisconsin

STUDIES IN THE ENGLISH RENAISSANCE DRAMA. Edited by Josephine W. Bennett, Oscar Cargill, and Vernon Hall, Jr. New York: New York University Press, 1959; pp. xxviii+368. $6.00.

Karl J. Holzknecht, in whose memory this *Festschrift* was compiled, "was not a brilliant research student, . . . [a] supersensitive critic, . . . [or a] philosopher-enthusiast. As a matter of fact," Mr. Cargill goes on in his curious prefatory biography, "he was in his lifetime a little scornful of these aerial performers." It is highly ironic, then, if not just a trifle amusing that the contributors to this volume are, to a man, the very things Professor Holzknecht was not, practitioners of the very mystery he scorned.

Professor A. C. Baugh, in the volume's first article, puts forth a convincing argument which will explain, in part at least, the apparently senseless and illogical pointing in Elizabethan printed dramas. Fredson Bowers, in "The Death of Hamlet," attempts to determine, legally, the degree of guilt Hamlet takes with him to the grave.

Hardin Craig's "Revised Elizabethan Quartos" will surely be the most controversial article in the volume. As A. W. Pollard described "bad quartos" as a general class of Elizabethan printed plays, so Professor Craig attempts to describe "revised quartos" as a class. His study is based on the assumption, and it is a highly debatable one to be sure, that Elizabethan acting companies released manuscripts to publishers only when the plays underwent revision, thereby making the original manuscript superfluous. When a dramatist revised an old play, preparing both foul papers and fair copy, the old manuscript prompt book, since it was no longer needed, might be released for publication. In some cases the extra copy, the foul papers, might be released and it would fit into Professor Craig's category of "revised quartos."

There is much that is attractive in Craig's theory. It is refreshing to read a bibliographical study in which each and every textual irregularity is not explained away to that most agile of ghosts, the Elizabethan reporter. However, Craig does not even bother to argue his case; he merely states it. The article is not a good one, and it is as doubtful as it is regrettable that Professor Craig will gain few adherents to his theory.

Giles Dawson gives us a fascinating glimpse of the cutthroat battle between two eighteenth-century publishers, Robert Walker and Jacob Tonson. Alfred Harbage suggests that *Perkin Warbeck* was a collaborative effort of Middleton and Dekker, with the lion's share of the writing done by Dekker. Other articles worthy of note are Samuel Schoenbaum's *"A Chaste Maid in Cheapside* and Middleton's City Comedy," G. F. Reynolds' *"Mucedorus,* Most Popular Elizabethan Play?", Vernon Hall's *"Julius Caesar,* A Play without Political Bias," and Waldo F. McNeir's "Heywood's Sources for the Main Plot of *A Woman Killed with Kindness.*"

ALBERT B. WEINER
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute

ADOLPHE APPIA'S "THE WORK OF LIVING ART": A THEORY OF THE THEATRE. Translated by H. D. Albright. And "MAN IS THE MEASURE OF ALL THINGS." Translated by Barnard Hewitt. Edited by Barnard Hewitt. Coral Gables, Fla.: University of Miami Press, 1960; pp. xxiv+131. $6.50.

Next year the theatre world will celebrate the centennial of Adolphe Appia's (1862-1928) birth. Particularly in Switzerland, his native country, the innovator of the new stagecraft will be commemorated. Books such as the first publication of his basic work *La musique et la mise en scène* in the original French version (hitherto only available in a rather weak German translation) and exhibitions of his designs are already in preparation. But however large the quantity of these writings and displays may grow between now and the festival year, it will be hard to match the superior quality of the second volume in *Books of The Theatre Series* issued jointly by the American Educational Theatre Association and the University of Miami Press. As also for the initial volume of the series, *The Renaissance Stage,* Professor Hewitt has been an ideal editor. He even took on the additional responsibility of translating, superbly, "Man is the Measure of all Things," a brief essay apparently intended to preface another one on "living art" which Appia did not live to write. As it is we should be doubly glad that we now have in Albright's inspired translation, and with his fine scholarly introduction, "The Work of Living Art," considered by Appia himself "to be the most significant of his publications." It is indeed a sublime expression of his mature thought.

Both writings contained in the present volume, as well as the several illustrations (admirably selected and most accurately inter-

preted), reveal once again Appia's new approach to theatre. His basic aim was to "strengthen the dramatic action." This was to be done not only through the setting but quite as much through the lighting. His purpose was to serve the actor: "It is the presence of the actor upon the stage which causes dramatic action; without actors there would be no action." Appia also recognized that three-dimensional construction could not solve by itself the conflict between the living actor and a dead setting. He saw that they must be united and dramatized by light. Moreover, he asked for "living light." He wanted the lighting on the stage to change with the passage of time. "The *mise-en-scène,*" he wrote, "is a picture composed in time."

"*Living* space for our *living* beings" is the quintessence of "The Work of Living Art." This essay more than any other of his theoretical and philosophical writings suggests strongly that without Appia there might have been no Craig and, perhaps, no Stanislavski or Reinhardt.

Like the first volume of the Miami Press Series, the Appia book constitutes a most creditable publishing job. It is only by way of a footnote that I register my unhappiness about seeing the name of a world-famous composer consistently misspelled. It is, of course, Gluck (not Glück). I also would have preferred to see the ending of the sentence begun on page 87 opposite Adolphe Appia's imposing portrait instead of facing an empty page.

This publishing, in brilliant translation, of one of the most significant works on the art of the theatre, is a remarkable and commendable undertaking, the first salute to the Appia Centennial.

WILLIAM W. MELNITZ
University of California, Los Angeles

THE EARLY PUBLIC THEATRE IN FRANCE. By W. L. Wiley. Harvard University Press, 1960; xiv+326. $6.75.

MOLIÈRE: THE COMIC MASK. By D. B. Wyndham Lewis. New York: Coward-McCann, 1959; pp. 215. $4.00.

The seventeenth-century French theatre has been well served by twentieth-century scholars. Although theatre historians writing in English have not lavished attention upon it nearly to the same degree that they have upon the concurrent English theatre, the results have, for the most part, been happier. Scholars of the early French theatre have been few in number and their discoveries less sensational and bizarre than those of their colleagues who submerge themselves in the marshy Bankside, but their books (and one thinks of the works of H. C. Lancaster, among others) have been distinguished, sometimes monumental. Professor Wiley's *The Early Public Theatre in France* is such a book. It brilliantly fills the gap in the scholarship of the French theatre from 1580 to 1630. Here we are presented with a panorama of the colorful theatrical *quartiers* of Paris, whose activities were as turbulent and chaotic as the precarious political equilibrium of the country itself. We are taken, so it seems to this reader, within the acting companies, we stroll with the farce-players and street-entertainers, and we watch a tennis court evolve into a full-fledged public theatre. Professor Wiley sets his stages with scenery, costumes, and actors, and we join the "milling mass of uncatalogued humanity" in the *parterre* of the Hôtel de Bourgogne. The book is more than a vicarious tour of the early Parisian theatre. In this "survey"—indeed, it is much more than a survey—Professor Wiley has amassed through careful research into little-known memoirs and archives an impressive number of details on the early French public theatre, and has set them forth in an interesting and well-organized fashion. The book is copiously footnoted, handsomely illustrated, and clearly written. It should be *the* standard for scholars of the period for many years to come. As an example of distinguished scholarship in theatre history there are few better.

In *Molière: The Comic Mask,* the eminent biographer and journalist Wyndham Lewis has given us another happy book, one which nicely complements the account written by Professor Wiley. Lewis's concern is with a slightly later and more familiar period of French theatrical history, yet his sparkling style and his blending of Molière's plays with the ironic tragicomedy of the dramatist's life result in a study of stature. Lewis states his plan in the Introduction: "From a score of biographers one may discover nothing new about the trials of a great, rich, weary actor-manager-dramatist suspecting himself to be a cuckold, but there is something new about any genius to be found in his works." The idea of constructing a biography of a dramatist by confining one's study to his plays is neither unique nor new. The attempt, however, has frequently been misinformed and doomed to failure. Witness the example of Shakespearean scholarship. The

virtue of Mr. Lewis's book is that the method succeeds, perhaps because Lewis is so excellent a biographer and Molière is so apt a subject.

By authoritative chronicles, fascinating accounts of theatrical rivalries, the tracing of Molière's unhappy loves, and the presentation of a cast of characters ranging from *Le Roi Soleil* to the lowliest servant—all blended into a sensitive appreciation of the comedies—Lewis has fashioned the best biography of Molière yet written. It gains its stature mainly because Mr. Lewis does not strictly adhere to his plan of allowing the plays to reveal the man. Rather, he returns the horse to the front of the proverbial cart, and by first providing a solid foundation of historical facts and interpretations he offers further insights into the plays, and finally, as a consequence, into the comic mask of the dramatist himself.

KALMAN A. BURNIM
Tufts University

PIRANDELLO AND THE FRENCH THEATRE. By Thomas Bishop. New York: New York University Press, 1960; pp. xxii+170. $4.50.

This little book not only treats a rare subject, but does so in an interesting and readable fashion. Professor Bishop attempts "a systematic examination of all the aspects of Pirandello's role in the French Theatre." Of especial merit is his analysis of the ideas in Pirandello's plays, and the professional success of those plays. Somewhat less successful is his specific application of those ideas to the French theatre from the nineteen-twenties to 1957. Yet, while one might quarrel with his conclusions regarding the distinctness and measurability of Pirandello's influence, one must at least accept the similarities—some remarkable, some quite possibly incidental—in the subject materials of many French playwrights to those of Pirandello, as traced by Professor Bishop.

The author marks five basic ideas or concepts which he finds to be thematic in the works of Pirandello: The Relativity of Truth; Duality of Personality; Form Versus Life; (an unorthodox) Morality; and (a pervading spirit of) Pessimism. He traces them with care through such plays as *Liola, Il Berretto a sonagli, Il Piacere dell'onesta, L'Uomo la bestia e la virtu, Il Giuoco delle part, La Patente,* and, of course, *Sei personaggi in cerca d'autore,* and *Enrico IV*. Although these thematic elements interact upon and inter-affect one another, Professor Bishop treats them separately for the sake of clarity in discussion.

Virtues of his discussion are clarity and simplicity, both regarding Pirandellian ideas, *per se,* and the illustrations of them in specific plays. The author avoids the symbolistic ambiguity of Pirandello's own published explanation of *Six Characters in Search of an Author.*

Almost three-fourths of his book involves painstaking application of Pirandellian ideas to the plays of the French theatre. Professor Bishop finds self-deception and illusion in the plays of Sarment, Gantillon, Pellerin, Romains, and Marcel. He finds an echo of the Pirandellian actor-play relationship in plays of Gheon. He considers the study of the multiplicity of personality to be Pirandellian in the writing of Lenormand. He finds illusion and absurdity in the writings of Achard, Salacrou, Giraudoux, Guitry, and Anouilh, and in the postwar writings of Sartre, Camus, Adamov, Ionesco, Neveux, and Genet.

While one might require more definitive and extended evidence regarding the specific influence of Pirandello on individual French playwrights, the fact remains that the author has written an often fascinating study both of Pirandello, and every important French playwright since the turn of the century. One must, therefore, accept and respect Professor Bishop's suggestion that at least "an accord of ideas between two authors" is visible in the plays of the French theatre after 1922. Professor Bishop feels this is true "in certain cases." This reviewer would suggest that "most cases" might be more accurate.

ARTHUR L. HOUSMAN
Minnesota State College, St. Cloud

REVOLUTION IN THE THEATRE: CONCLUSIONS CONCERNING THE MUNICH ARTISTS' THEATRE. By Georg Fuchs. Condensed and adapted from the German by Constance Connor Kuhn. Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1959; pp. xxxii+220. $4.75.

Georg Fuchs was the founder of the Munich *Künstlertheater* and in this book, first published in Germany in 1908, he recounts the motives that led to its founding and the principles under which it operated up to the First World War. The present translation should be, then, a historical document, a record of the past. Perhaps it is not surprising that it turns out to be something more, for in a curious way it is a manifesto for *all* "revolutions" in the theatre; theatrical revolutions, it seems to indicate, are conventional, not to say

conservative, in intent, and are more often designed to reestablish something that has been lost than to invent a novelty. The key is expressed by Fuch's epigraph: *"Rethéâtraliser le théâtre!"*

Here, for example, are some comments on the theatre and the art of the stage which have the timeless ring of familiarity: "We expect a festival and find only fatigue" (Goethe?); stage design "determines the nature of the drama in so far as the play, the actor, the text—in short, everything that concerns the presentation—is inextricably bound up with the setting in the midst of which the action takes place" (Saxe-Meiningen?); the theatre was at its lowest ebb "when it had become merely a repository for literature" (Walter Kerr?); "Dramatic art is, in its own way, dancing, that is, rhythmic movement of the human body in space" (Copeau?); "Out of his own being [the actor] must create in substance and in truth the figure the poet designates" (Stanislavsky?); "For the greater part of the dramatic action, this reproduction of a particular place, together with its necessary depth of stage, is at best superfluous and at worst annoying. The spectator must continually shake off the distraction it imposes so that he may direct his attention to those things which are really important" (James Boaden?).

From Goethe to Walter Kerr—and there are passages that might have been written by Craig, Appia, Max Reinhardt. The similarities among these revolutionaries and reformers are basic; the differences are only the particular masks they have chosen to wear. Fuchs' originality lies in the relief stage he advocated; far from being a Stanislavskyite as the preceding paragraph may have sugggested, he insisted that the actor abandon "the individual and the accidental" and raise himself "to the universal and the absolute." But the ultimate end, the revitalizing of the dramatic experience, he shared with all the other writers of theatrical manifestos. The opening line of *Faust*, his first production, could be the watchword of any theatrical reform movement, whether it was born to wither in a bohemian cellar, or, like the *Künstlertheater*, go on to commercial success: *"Die Sonne tönt nach alter Weise."*

ALAN S. DOWNER
Princeton University

KINO: A HISTORY OF THE RUSSIAN AND SOVIET FILM. By Jay Leyda. New York: Macmillan, 1960; pp. 493+32 plates. $9.50.

Kino opens in Moscow in 1895. Czar Nicholas II ordered that candy be distributed to the crowds at his coronation, and filmed riots ensued—doubtless a prelude to the mob scenes three decades later in Eisenstein's masterpiece, *Battleship Potemkin* (1925). Mr. Leyda's study moves to the verge of the present when there is an apparent resurgence of Russian cinema art. Since Stalin's death in 1953, the cultural commissars have relented, though not retired. Mr. Leyda tells how, at the outset of *Kino*, Russian intellectuals were alive to the power of the new art form. Gorky, covering a fair in Nizhni-Novgorod in 1896, remarked the "tremendous novelty" of movies, and Tolstoy, in the year of his death (1910) declared, "I must write for cinema."

One odd, sad fact of movie history is that in 1915, in wartime, and under Czarist rule, Russian cinema did its best work with literary classics. In 1915, two films were based on Tolstoy's *War and Peace*, two on Turgenev (*Song of Triumphant Love* and *A Nest of Noblemen*), and two on Ibsen (*Ghosts* and *Brand*). Also playing in 1915 were pictures based on Strindberg (*Miss Julie*), Dickens (*Cricket on the Hearth*), Dostoyevsky (*Possessed*), Pushkin (*Ruslan i Ludmila*), and Wilde (*The Picture of Dorian Gray*). All the prints of Vsevolod Meyerhold's *Dorian Gray* were scrapped when the Soviets needed the celluloid: this is too bad since the picture is said to have been a surrealistic masterpiece, one which surpassed Fritz Lang's later dip into surrealism, *The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari* (Germany, 1920). Of course, the Russian movie public did not buy tickets only to the classics. One of the most popular pictures of 1915 points up Soviet realism, as well as Marxist wish-fantasy, *An American Millionaire Perishes on the Lusitania*. The name of the doomed man was Vanderbilt!

Mr. Leyda aptly deals at length with the work of that great triad of Russian filmmakers —Eisenstein, Pudovkin, and Dovzhenko—who achieved such excellence in Russian cinema between the two World Wars. Four of Eisenstein's six completed films, the silents *Strike* and *Potemkin* (both in 1925), *October* (1927), and his talkie *Alexander Nevsky* (1938) would give Russia an eminent place among filmmaking countries.

Too briefly, in a Postscript of seven pages, Mr. Leyda sums up the cinematic record of 1948-1958. In the deep cultural freeze of the Cold War, *The Russian Question* (*c.* 1948), both as a play and movie, depicted the woes

in America in so gross a way that life in the United States comes out as a grotesque joke. *The Russian Question* parodies itself. The hero, an American journalist, who tries to write truthfully about Russia, loses all—his wife, his job, etc. In a grim, bourgeois way, Russian films of the last decade seem to insist, relentlessly, upon the exclusive sanctity of married love. Offhand, I can think of three recent Russian films in which otherwise sympathetic girls get the whip, or worse, for taking up with another while their true love is at the front. The trilogy is *Quiet Flows the Don* (Part 1), *The Cranes Are Flying*, and *Ballad of a Soldier*. However, these three films, and some others (*The Grasshopper*, *The Idiot*, Part 1, and *The Forty-First*) suggest a comeback of Russian cinema art. *Ballad* and *The Forty-First* are both lyrical, touching love stories; both were directed by Grigori Chukhrai. But sad to say, all the recent good Soviet films contain elements of violence with which *Kino* began in 1895.

HERBERT FEINSTEIN
San Francisco State College

DOCTRINE AND POETRY: AUGUSTINE'S INFLUENCE ON OLD ENGLISH POETRY. By Bernard F. Huppé. New York: University Publishers, 1959; pp. viii+248. $6.00.

Books treating Saint Augustine's theory of communication are rare, especially in English, and so we should probably greet with enthusiasm any new entry into the field. It may be necessary, however, to temper our enthusiasm for Professor Huppé's contribution. His thesis, briefly, is that Augustine proposes in his *De Doctrina Christiana* a "Christian theory of literature," that all medieval Christians subscribed to this theory, and that Caedmon and other Old English poets can best be understood in light of this theory.

Augustine's theory of literature, according to the author, is that the Bible is the best model, and that it is not to be read for the literal meaning alone but for symbolic and allegorical meanings as well. By extension, then, Christian literature should be written and read in the same way. The author points to Augustine's so-called "law of love"—that is, that any doubtful passages should be "turned over in the mind" until an interpretation is found that promotes the reign of Charity. Professor Huppé then proceeds to link Bede, Alcuin, and other early Christians to this general theory, and discusses a number of Old English poems, especially Caedmon's *Hymn* and *Genesis A*.

The author's treatment of Augustine's *De Doctrina*, however, vitiates the whole argument. Despite Augustine's explicit statement at the beginning of the work that it deals first with understanding Scripture and then separately with expressing its ideas to others, Professor Huppé virtually ignores the implications of this basically Ciceronian doctrine. Indeed, he pays little attention to the whole discussion of Ciceronian rhetoric in Book Four of the *De Doctrina*. This is a curious method to apply to a work so explicitly divided into *invention* and *expression*.

In effect, then, Professor Huppé believes that Augustine's apparent praise of Biblical obscurity is to be interpreted as a praise of obscurity in all expression. Leaving aside for a moment Book Four—with its emphatic call for clarity as the first duty of the speaker—even the text of the earlier books shows that Augustine is merely evaluating God's intentions in dotting the Bible with enigmatic passages. The testimony of later Christians would also tend to indicate that the *De Doctrina* was not widely accepted in this limited manner. Rhabanus Maurus and Alain de Lille, for instance, take the whole work into account. No doubt the apologist for allegorical interpretations of literature can find some comfort in certain portions of the *De Doctrina Christiana*, but to restrict its application to this one aspect is to create a sad confusion between hermeneutics and rhetoric.

JAMES J. MURPHY
Princeton University

THE POLITICAL REASON OF EDMUND BURKE. By Francis Canavan, S.J. Published for the Lilly Endowment Research Program in Christianity and Politics. Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1960; pp. xvi+222. $5.00.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF EDMUND BURKE: A SELECTION FROM HIS SPEECHES AND WRITINGS. Edited by Louis I. Bredvold and Ralph G. Ross. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1960; pp. vi+276. Text, paper $3.50.

SELECTED WRITINGS OF EDMUND BURKE. Edited by W. J. Bate. Modern Library No. 289. New York: Random House, 1960; pp. viii+536. $1.95.

Prominent in the rapid accumulation of new scholarship and criticism relating to Ed-

mund Burke are the book-length attempts—five in less than as many years—to synthesize a philosophy for him. Burke left no systematic construction of a political or social philosophy, and especially no metaphysics; yet he is rightly known as the philosopher in politics. His works supplied his contemporaries and the principal statesmen of the succeeding century with their armory of political ideas and operating principles; and he has had a resurgence in the present generation as the patron saint of the new conservatism, the exemplar of enlightened liberalism, the bulwark against anti-Christ in politics, and the prescient antagonist of communism. Hence one is not surprised that what Burke said over a prolific career of forty years is culled again and again for statements with theoretical and philosophical significance. It is equally unremarkable that historian, critic, and biographer should find in the total of those cullings (either in the context of Burke's political activity or independent of it, as suits the writer's purpose) transcendent unity or underlying consistency. No more should one be amazed that the interpretations vary widely, and that none of the recent strugglers with Burke's philosophy have been more successful in finding clarifying concepts for handling it than were their predecessors Morley, Stephen, MacCunn, Laski, and Cobban.

Collecting, organizing, and manipulating Burke's philosophical dicta is undoubtedly profitable, and certainly challenging. System-making, however, if we suppose that thereby we are coming close to the functioning Burke, may create quite a false impression of his habits of thought and discourse. We need, I suggest, some extensive examination of *how he used* his generalizations and his moral and philosophical pronouncements.

That use varied much from one time of his life to another; and as one might expect, the completeness and fullness of his *a priori* system are certainly more manifest after 1790 than before 1780. In combatting the French Revolution, Burke had to confront one operating philosophy of society with another, and he did so with remarkable success. Even then, however, and certainly in his early and middle career, Burke used philosophical pronouncements and general statements less as premises from which to derive his position than as timbers with which to support it. Rather than reasoning logically and philosophically *from* premises, he seems to move rhetorically *toward* principles which in use are not unlike the time-honored *sententiae* of oratory and drama. Burke's philosophical system *in use* was thought out as fully at any stage of his career as it needed to be to sustain the argumentative burdens which he would put upon it. It seems, however, more like a grand imaginative intuition which *must* be true, than a philosophical system which is demonstrated to be true. Burke didn't require the demonstration; he required only the application to action. To his explicators falls the demonstration.

The first two volumes now under review, like their predecessors by Stanlis and Parkin, for example, turn some fresh light upon Burke's thinking. Especially in his first chapter, Fr. Canavan furnishes as direct a statement as may be found anywhere of Burke's primary focus upon operative reason as distinguished from pure thought, a reason which directs action and is therefore concerned "with attaining goals which men find good rather than with propositions which they find true" (p. 6). "Burke clearly took the postulates of his moral theory from a natural-law doctrine. But he always approached the doctrine from below, so to speak, that is, from the discussion of a concrete political or legal question" (p. 17). Fr. Canavan thus circles round what seems to me an essential, almost obvious consideration which the formulators of Burke's philosophy (including Fr. Canavan) seem to overlook or to disregard: that Burke's thought, or his insight, or his intuition, is always expressed in a rhetorical context and the expression grows more out of the demands of rhetorical than philosophical problems.

The foregoing is a generalization which there is not space to demonstrate. Grant it, however, and certain consequences follow. It is a mistake to treat Burke's thought as if it were all one for a period of forty years, so that a statement gleaned from the *Present Discontents* of 1770 can be justly built into a passage from the *Letter to a Noble Lord* of 1796 with which it appears to harmonize, or can be opposed to such a statement which it appears to modify. Not only does time sometimes effect changes of position and outlook, but differing rhetorical circumstances induce into discourse variations in intensity, color, and emphasis of expression which amount to differences in meaning. Let us cite, for example, the normal rhetorical practice of stating limited, practical, momentary truths as if they were universal, independent principles. No statements are liable to so much transformation from loss of context

as statements from rhetorical discourse. If one were drawing upon philosophical essays from a period of forty years in a man's life, one would be unlikely to synthesize them as if they were contemporaneous, but rather to compare them on the assumption of probable development and change. How much less should one use isolated statements from rhetorical works any other way?

Fr. Canavan, like Parkin and Stanlis, both recognizes and disregards the principle of time and context. So do Bredvold and Ross. Since they are anthologizing, however, rather than explicating, their interpretations lie in the excerpting and grouping of substantial, *dated* passages. Thus they leave their reader some resources for his own judgments of relevance. Under such chapter headings as "Prudence as a Political Virtue," "Government and Human Nature," "Reform and Tradition," and "Jacobinism," the editors gather what seem to them relevant excerpts, in length from a line to several pages, from the whole range of published works and correspondence. A brief headnote introduces each chapter. A short general introduction turns so quickly into polemic against communism that one is reminded more of Burke's passion in the *Letters on a Regicide Peace* than of the historical perspective of a Morley or a Grierson.

W. J. Bate's anthology makes available a highly satisfactory selection of readings in the convenient, durable, inexpensive Modern Library form. Six important works appear in full: the speeches on *American Taxation* and on *Conciliation*, and the final speech in the trial of Warren Hastings; the *Letter to the Sheriffs of Bristol, Thoughts on French Affairs*, and the *Letter to a Noble Lord*. Eighty pages from *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, Burke's most celebrated work, are probably enough in a limited collection when, as Bate says, the *Reflections* is already available in several inexpensive editions. Other excerpts of from five to twenty pages represent the issues of Catholicism and Ireland, the famous speech on *Economical Reform*, regulation of the East India Company, the opening of the trial of Hastings, and the *Letters on a Regicide Peace*. Though offering less variety and abundance than Hoffman and Levack's *Burke's Politics*, this anthology is probably more useful for the rhetorical student because of the inclusion principally of complete, unfragmented works.

One is never entirely satisfied with another's choices of works and passages; hence, although I would not eliminate any of the pieces which Professor Bate has included, I should suggest that the reader find for himself *Thoughts on the Cause of Present Discontents* (1770), Burke's exposition and justification of his own party and of party allegiance generally, and the speech of Burke's combining most completely the noble, the realistic, and the artistic, the speech at Bristol prior to the election of 1780.

Even if the selection itself were not excellent, Professor Bate's volume would be a real addition to the illumination of Burke because of the admirable forty-page interpretive Introduction. Refreshing, independent, at once sympathetic and penetrating, this is the best single general essay on Burke, at least since Woodrow Wilson's.

DONALD C. BRYANT
University of Iowa

THE CORRESPONDENCE OF EDMUND BURKE, VOLUME II, JULY 1768—JUNE 1774. Edited by Lucy S. Sutherland. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, and Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960; pp. xxiii+567. $12.00.

This is the second of a projected ten volumes under the general editorship of Thomas W. Copeland, who edited the first volume (see review in *QJS*, December, 1958). Volume II is the work of the Principal of Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford, an historian especially learned in English economic and commercial history of the 1760's, '70's, and '80's in which Burke was a significant participant. Miss Sutherland's Introduction, headnotes, and footnotes are indeed rich and impressive, not only in abundance of annotation and range of resources, but in restraint. Relevance and illumination are the criteria, strictly observed.

The letters derive from one of the periods of Burke's most sanguine hopes and at the same time severe disappointments. By 1768 Burke was established in the Rockingham connection, his brief flirtation with the Chathamites decisively ended, and was about to begin his career as a distinguished party writer: *Observation on . . . The Present State of the Nation* (1769), *Present Discontents* (1770). Burke's initial success was developing into a just celebrity in oratory and debate, and he was proving himself more and more a man of business both in Parliament and in his party. This was also the period of his purchase of Gregories and the establishing of his family as county landowners. On the other side,

however, it was the time of the collapse of India stock and the permanent financial embarrassment of the Burkes, and of the rise of Lord North and the almost permanent exclusion of the Rockinghams from power. The volume ends just after Burke's speech on *American Taxation* was delivered, but before it was published. Throughout it we see the Burke who was becoming the powerful politician and distinguished statesman sought as M.P. for Britain's second city, Bristol, in the summer of 1774.

Of the 253 letters in addition to those quoted in headnotes, tailnotes, and footnotes, 185 are wholly or in part Burke's. Fifty-five of Burke's have not been published previously, and many more (those to O'Hara) only recently have been discovered. All but twelve of the 253 have been printed from MS sources, either originals or drafts and copies. For the same period the *Correspondence* of 1844 included less than one-fourth as many letters. An interim index of names is included, pending the appearance of a full index of names and subjects in the final volume. Volume III, covering the period of Burke's connection with Bristol, will appear this year, edited by George H. Guthridge of the University of California.

DONALD C. BRYANT
University of Iowa

ARISTOTLE. By John Herman Randall, Jr. New York: Columbia University Press, 1960; pp. xviii+309. $5.00.

Students of ancient rhetoric have long needed a modern simply written account of Aristotle's philosophy as a whole. There are numerous accounts available, to be sure, but they are mostly for the specialist. This book by a distinguished Columbia University professor provides for the general reader what Werner Jaeger's *Aristotle: Fundamentals of the History of His Development* does for the philosopher.

The volume deals *inter alia* with Aristotle's life and writings, his fundamental methods and concepts, first philosophy, natural processes, biological theory, and the practical sciences. For us the most pertinent chapter is called "The Productive Sciences: Knowing How to Make Things." It touches on Aristotle's theory of art, how to write a speech, and how to create a tragic poem.

According to the author Aristotle "could scarcely display the originality" in the Rhetoric that he does elsewhere. The Rhetoric was a compilation of different sets of notes and comes from a keen observer, a man who had no illusions about how a speaker must appeal to men.

For the beginning student Professor Randall has made clear such important concepts as commonplaces, excellences of character, imagination, imitation, and form. The final chapter on The Heritage of Aristotle traces Aristotle, the natural investigator and Aristotle, "the syllogistic gentlemen with a category for every emergency." It tells what Aristotelianism has meant over the centuries.

This is a book that may make students of speech want to read Aristotle's *Logic* and *Politics*. The chapter on The Analysis of Discourse with its treatment of dialectic is especially recommended.

H. F. HARDING
The Ohio State University

HARRIET MARTINEAU: A RADICAL VICTORIAN. By R. K. Webb. New York: Columbia University Press; London: William Heinemann, 1960; pp. xiii+385. $5.00.

Claiming that previous biographers of Harriet Martineau have "succumbed" either to the "causes" into which she put her energy or to her "eccentricities," Columbia University historian, Webb, argues that "none of them has really studied or understood her opinions or their origin in her times." He proposes, not a biography, but a critical study of nineteenth-century forces which formed or were reflected in the life of Miss Martineau. The study "comes down to an attempt to define Victorian radicalism."

The author is concerned with the "public image" of Miss Martineau. He examines her prolific writings, *Illustrations of Political Economy, Society in America, Retrospect of Western Travel, History of the Thirty Years' Peace*, and other books, and her editorial writings in the *Daily News* and other English and American periodicals and newspapers. "Everything she wrote," he finds, "fell into the didactic pattern and served a particular cause." Among these "causes" were religion, political economy, health, anti-slavery, positivism, household education, mesmerism, the sufferings of the poor, etc. Her "best writing" Webb finds in the *History of the Thirty Years' Peace* and her editorial writing for the *Daily News*, where the "quality of her prose is almost unvarying and thoroughly in accord with the canons of the fine journalistic style of the middle of the century." Her well-known *Illustrations of Polit-*

ical Economy are "important, not because they taught political economy, but because they evoked a response."

The author concludes that "Norwich . . . provided two conditions of her radicalism, one stemming from its economy and the social problems it engendered, the other arising from her position in the liberal, educated, and ambitious manufacturing middle class. The third condition lies in Unitarianism."

Unfortunately, the author, although frequently calling attention to her art of popularization and the response it evoked, does not examine with care either her theory or her method of popularization.

The book is marred to some extent both by critical eagerness which produces dubious conclusions and by poor proofreading. In the main, however, it is an interesting study of the early Victorian radical temper, as it is reflected in the writings of Miss Martineau.

MARIE HOCHMUTH NICHOLS
University of Illinois

LINCOLN'S MANAGER, DAVID DAVIS. By Willard L. King. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960; pp. xiv+383. $6.75.

This impressive study might well serve as a model for all biographers. Well documented, coherently organized, and clear and unpretentious in style, *Lincoln's Manager* gives new insight into the politics of mid-nineteenth-century America, as well as an engrossing narrative of the life of Lincoln's closest political associate. Based upon an examination of more than 20,000 of Judge Davis's papers, numerous contemporary newspapers, and a thorough canvass of the Robert Todd Lincoln Collection, the biography supplements our knowledge of Lincoln and demonstrates that not all Lincoln items are merely duplications of earlier works.

Although by no means a popular orator, David Davis (1815-1866) nevertheless proved his talent for leadership as a frontier lawyer and businessman, circuit-riding judge, Lincoln's manager at the Chicago convention of 1860, justice of the Supreme Court, and United States senator. Those concerned with civil liberty will remember him for his eloquent decision in *Ex parte Milligan* (1866): "Martial rule can never exist where the courts are open, and in the proper and unobstructed exercise of their jurisdiction." "The Constitution," Davis concluded, ". . . is a law for rulers and people, equally in war and peace."

Mr. King, a distinguished Chicago attorney, provides the student of public address with striking descriptions of Lincoln as a trial lawyer, the Lincoln-Douglas debates, and frontier stump speaking. His account of the battle over Lincoln's cabinet appointments is the best currently available, but his discussion of the settlement of 1876 seemingly ignores the definitive research that C. Vann Woodward reported in *Reunion and Reaction*. In his remarkably detailed discussion of Illinois politics, Mr. King describes the business-oriented attitudes of Whiggish leaders who often functioned as land speculators, debt collectors, and representatives of the railroads, as well as politicians.

Masculine preoccupation with law and politics aroused an understandable jealousy in the distaff side. "I trust you will never be a politician," Mrs. Davis advised her son at Beloit College. "Life seems too valuable to be wasted in the turmoil of politics."

One cannot read this volume without gaining a greater appreciation of the dominant role of speechmaking in frontier life. "No wonder your public men are good speakers," wrote Davis's father-in-law from the restrained atmosphere of Massachusetts. "From yr accts they are eternally talking."

R. G. G.

THE JOURNALS AND MISCELLANEOUS NOTEBOOKS OF RALPH WALDO EMERSON. VOLUME I, 1819-1822. Edited by William H. Gilman, *et al.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960; pp. 1+430. $10.00.

Professor Gilman and his colleagues are revealing a new Emerson. The first in their planned sixteen-volume edition of his journals and notebooks demonstrates clearly that the image of Emerson projected by the 1909-1914 edition was significantly affected by editorial deletions and alterations. Seen in a transcription of day-to-day jottings which is as literal as feasible, Emerson is a sharper critic of men and society, his thought is more detailed and specific, and his mood is generally gloomier than previous editions of his papers have suggested.

Students of British and American public address will be especially interested in comments on speakers and speaking which were hitherto unavailable in print or were modified by Emerson or his editors before publication. Although the journals and notebooks presented in this first volume (written for the most part before his twentieth birthday) contain no important surprises, they promise interesting rev-

elations in later papers. Even this first installment provides such items as a description of the setting for an eloquent speech (p. 7) and an estimate of the superiority of political cunning over deliberative eloquence (pp. 118-120), both of which were omitted from the 1909-1914 edition. From their privileged position, the editors confidently predict greater surprises in future volumes.

In making available a complete, accurate text with additions and cancelled passages carefully noted, the editors facilitate much more extensive study of the development of Emerson's style and habits of composition than has yet been accomplished. His earlier editors had a precedent in the practice of the writer himself for occasional deletions. Consider the following journal entry which was incorporated into "The Preacher" without the italicized words: "What sort of respect can these *unitarian or presbyterian* preachers or newspapers inspire by their weekly praises of texts and saints, when we know that they would say just the same things if *the Devil* Beelzebub had written the chapter, provided it stood where it does in public opinion *which they flatter & serve.*" Comparison of the journals with the published essays shows that Emerson frequently toned down his private observations in this manner for public consumption.

The annotation, identification of quotations, and textual notes, as well as representative facsimile manuscript pages, will aid students. An inadequate Index will hinder them, at least until an elaborate composite index appears in the final volume.

HARRY P. KERR
Harvard University

THE EVOLUTION OF WALT WHITMAN: THE CREATION OF A PERSONALITY. By Roger Asselineau. Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1960; pp. xiv+376. $7.50.

Whitman could not too often reiterate his desire to make of his *Leaves of Grass* a free, full, and true record of his personality. It is this record which Mr. Asselineau traces in his first volume of a two volume translation (in which he was assisted by Richard P. Adams) of his 1954 French edition. The second volume is to be a critical study of Whitman's works.

One might expect a rather dull result from the task of tracing Whitman's many additions and revisions. Yet this is not what Mr. Asselineau gives us. Instead, with an unerring sense of the drama of Whitman's struggle to overcome his anxieties and doubts, Mr. Asselineau shows us how, in his words, "each new edition marked a victory and was the resolution of a spiritual crisis." One crisis especially interesting to us in this Civil War centennial year is the crisis Whitman underwent during the war years. At first dedicated to a quick Northern victory for the sake of Democracy everywhere, he exalted the volunteers going into combat. He recognized the grand scale on which this first of all modern wars was fought, and he glorified "the drunken excitement of fighting." But, as Mr. Asselineau explains, "at the touch of harsh reality, his illusions were quickly dissipated; his idealistic concepts of a sacred and redeeming war collapsed as soon as he had a close view of the horrors with which it was inevitably accompanied." His whole approach to the war and to poetry about it became more human and subjective. He was horrified at the "horrible massacre of men" and grieved at the personal suffering of individual soldiers and their families. But if this new sense of the evil in the world at first shocked him, in the end he became stronger for it.

One danger with any dramatic approach to the biography of a complex figure is that of oversimplification. But here again, Mr. Asselineau avoids the danger and achieves the significant. Taking into account the mass of previous scholarship and a host of previously unpublished documents, he gracefully moves forward in his exposition of Whitman's personality without slighting necessary complications or qualifications. He disentangles Whitman's life from his work, yet recognizes the dependence of each upon the other. He recognizes the difference between the ideal poet of *Leaves of Grass* without slighting the real Whitman. Moreover, he recognizes the disorderly, searching, subjective nature of Whitman's achievement while still understanding its real significance.

IRVING DEER
Lock Haven State College, Pennsylvania

MARK TWAIN ON THE LECTURE CIRCUIT. By Paul Fatout. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1960; pp. 321. $6.00.

Dead fifty years, Mark Twain returns to the lectern through the agency of Paul Fatout's diligent research and able writing. Steering around Twain's after-dinner speaking—only temporarily if we are fortunate—Professor

Fatout of Purdue University's English department traces the humorist's fifty-three year career on the public platform from young Sam Clemens' maiden speech in Keokuk, Iowa, on January 17, 1856, to old Mark Twain's last speech in Catonsville, Maryland, on June 10, 1909. Wherever Twain lectured—in San Francisco or Grass Valley, California, in Brooklyn or Cohoes, New York, in St. Louis or Hannibal, Missouri, or abroad in Sydney or Geelong, Australia, in Bombay or Mazaffarpur, India, in Johannesburg or Pietermaritzburg, South Africa—Fatout follows him through contemporary newspaper accounts in the local press.

Fatout's volume corrects mistaken ideas and clarifies hazy aspects of Twain's lecture career. Those who have accepted Mark's account of his first paid lecture as related in *Roughing It* have lent credence to fiction. Twain neither had reason to be nor was the hesitant and timorous speaker he recalls; he was a hero to San Franciscans who had all but bought out the house days before the lecture. After disproving other parts of Twain's version, Fatout concludes that the years between the speech and the writing of *Roughing It* "were enough to blur fact with fancy in the mind of so imaginative a man." Fatout also corrects the impression that Twain's tour with George W. Cable was a fitful, fretful affair. Though not matched in temperament, the two got on nobly for the most part.

In this time especially, when Twain is being celebrated throughout the land, we are apt to have the impression that his public lectures were unqualified successes. Fatout takes nothing from the man but does show that more than occasionally audiences were slim or unresponsive.

Twain worked hard; he wrote and rewrote and varied and repaired the delivery of what was a surprisingly small number of basic lectures. He rehearsed to the point of exhaustion and ultimately memorized most of his material. Deceived by Dickens' apparent ease in reading aloud, Twain found to his discomfort that it required much preparation. He finally memorized needed passages and put his books aside.

Fatout's book is a genuine contribution. He can be forgiven Brander Matthews' quotation with which he concludes and which says in part that Twain was "a born speech maker."

ROBERT P. FRIEDMAN
University of Missouri

FREEDOM AND EQUALITY: ADDRESSES BY HARRY S. TRUMAN. Edited by David S. Horton. Columbia, Mo.: University of Missouri Press, 1960; pp. xxx+85. $2.95.

Of the nine addresses on freedom and equality in this little book, five are speeches delivered from 1940 to 1954, two are written messages to Congress which contain proposals for legislation, and two are veto messages. As the editor states, five speeches and messages on freedom concern "the problem of meeting the internal threat of Communism without destroying the freedoms guaranteed by the Bill of Rights"; three on equality "deal with . . . the treatment of our largest minority group, the Negroes"; and one message, the veto of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, "deals with both freedom and equality."

A twenty-page Introduction cites Truman's record on freedom and equality and supports the argument that Harry Truman has been, "in our own day, one of the staunchest champions of freedom and equality." The Introduction suggests, as the messages do not, that Truman's record on equality was compiled as much by his use of executive authority as by his support of legislation. A reader must remember, however, the problems of other minorities which add to the record. American Indians, Mexican immigrants, Japanese-Americans evacuated from the West Coast in the forties, and conscientious objectors imprisoned during the war presented problems small in number of individuals concerned but vast in their involvement with principles of equality.

No one should question the inclusion in this volume of Truman's special message on civil rights sent to Congress in February, 1948. Few people would question the inclusion of the address at Howard University in June, 1952, and the vetoes of the Internal Security Act of 1950 and the Immigration and Nationality Act. The editor includes no speeches from Truman's major political campaigns. I believe, however, that Truman's 1948 address in Oklahoma City or his 1952 speech in Boston depict, as no non-political speech can, his militant indignation and vigorous counter-attack when charged with being "soft on Communism."

Because of the sources used and the handling of the texts, this book contains an uncommon number of substantial errors. The editor fails to indicate the source for one speech text and relies on the *Congressional Record* and *The New York Times* for the other four. The reader is not told whether the texts are those

released in advance to the press or verbatim transcripts. Only one text appears to be verbatim, and a reader must turn to the *Times* to verify that.

The Truman Library contains authentic documents indicating advance and verbatim texts. A comparison of the Library documents and the texts reprinted from the *Record* shows the unreliability of the *Record*, particularly for speeches not delivered to Congress. For example, the text of the Howard University speech which was delivered on June 13, 1952, and not on June 16 as indicated in the book, is obviously not a verbatim text.

Although this volume will be useful in suggesting Truman's record and position on freedom and equality, the short Introduction and the imperfect texts limit its usefulness for serious study.

EDWARD ROGGE
Tulane University

HENRY A. WALLACE: QUIXOTIC CRUSADE 1948. By Karl M. Schmidt. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1960; pp. xvi+362. $5.50.

The Wallace campaign of 1948 was a complete failure. Not a single electoral vote was counted in the Progressive Party column and immediately following the election the party began to disintegrate. By 1952 Wallace and his fellow standard bearer, Senator Glen Taylor, had left the party, and complete control was in the hands of the extreme Left. Nevertheless, the Wallace candidacy deserves serious study as an important episode in recent American political history if only for the purpose of determining the reasons for its failure. Karl M. Schmidt, a political scientist at Syracuse University, has undertaken to describe and evaluate the campaign and Henry Wallace's role in the dismal venture. Schmidt is clear in his description of the genesis, the life and the collapse of the Progressive Party. He presents in detail the process whereby a movement designed to appeal to a broad range of American liberals became, ultimately, the property of an extremely vocal and active minority. In the end, any hope for a popular front was destroyed. Mr. Schmidt presents the provocative thesis that the Progressives would have fared much better if the non-Communists had not deserted the party and if they had been willing to work as hard as the Communists. One wonders whether, even in 1948, such a coalition was possible. Mr. Schmidt is probably correct in his judgment that Harry Truman's relatively liberal campaign was another important cause of the erosion of Progressive strength even though Truman did not change his stand on foreign policy, the most important area of disagreement between Wallace and the Democrats. As the campaign progressed, Wallace's rhetoric was addressed to a smaller and smaller audience. Wallace and the Progressives had misunderstood the bases of American Liberalism.

Schmidt's study is valuable although it is deficient in any real analysis of Wallace's ideological and motivational background. This reviewer must also confess to some puzzlement when Hubert Humphrey and Americans for Democratic Action are given the designation of "right wing."

HERMAN COHEN
University of Oregon

U.S. SENATORS AND THEIR WORLD. By Donald R. Matthews. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1960; pp. xvi+303. $6.00.

Donald R. Matthews musters an impressive and fascinating mass of detail in this admirable attempt at a collective behavioral study. An associate professor of political science at the University of North Carolina, the author draws upon ten years of study of the Senate; ten months of "total immersion" in its daily life; 109 interviews with senators, staff members, lobbyists, and journalists; and voluminous biographical data on the 180 men who served during the tumultuous decade from 1947 to 1957.

Senators Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., of Massachusetts, Homer Capehart of Indiana, Alben Barkley of Kentucky, and Glen Taylor of Idaho exemplify the four categories of politicians who tend to become senators: patricians, amateurs, professionals, and agitators.

Observation of the senators' "way of life" reveals a staggering round of campaigning, office work, social affairs, staff management, gnawing uncertainty, clashing loyalties. The "folkways" of the Senate jealously demand conformity to inglorious apprenticeship, legislative specialization, courtesy in debate, compromising reciprocity, and patriotism to the Club. Examinations of party leadership and committee activity verify the tremendous influence of these centers of power. Successive analyses of the relationship of senators with lobbyists, reporters, and their own constituents

offer insight into the legislative impact of these sources of influence. The final chapter on floor action is a brief but penetrating analysis of the reality of floor "debate."

The interested layman will not find a more balanced, complete, sophisticated, and intriguing account of the Senate anywhere. But the scholar must challenge the stimulating but uneven, often obvious, and sometimes forced series of tables, graphs, and statistical indices. Much of the distortion stems from the small, highly selective, ever-changing group of individuals that is the Senate. Hence, in many tables the percentage figures would be significantly altered by the change of one or two senators.

The "index of overrepresentation" reveals in elaborate tables much that is obvious from the basic data. To attempt to measure the complex and fluctuating "legislative effectiveness" by the single index of the ratio of bills and resolutions passed divided by the number sponsored is not to measure legislative effectiveness at all. It does measure the proportion of bills passed and sponsored—that, and little more. Although the author seems aware of the limitations of his statistical models, he seems determined to prove that "imprecise and provisional findings are better than none."

CHARLEY A. LEISTNER
Oberlin College

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL AND THE DECLINE OF LIBERAL EDUCATION. By Earl J. McGrath. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1959; pp. xii+65. Paper $1.50.

This pamphlet is a thesis, at times impassioned in tone, and Earl J. McGrath would like to nail it to the door of the graduate school. The thesis is implied in the title.

It rests on two assumptions, and the pamphlet is organized around them. The first is that liberal arts colleges "have lost their sense of special purpose." They no longer provide a comprehensive view of the major areas of knowledge—sciences, social sciences, and humanities. They no longer give proper training in "skills of reasoning and communication." They no longer nurture necessary "traits of mind and spirit."

The second is that this decline in liberal education is due to the graduate schools. These relatively new and bouncing units of higher education have trained teachers more interested in research than teaching. They have thus "splintered the corporate body which once was the liberal arts colleges into small and often completely unrelated departmental units." They have transformed the unified college curriculum into "an agglomeration of subjects."

McGrath proposes that graduate schools give training for prospective college teachers different from that for researchers and, if necessary, give a different kind of degree. Training for teaching would include more general education, less emphasis on factual research, seminars in teaching, and apprenticeship teaching. He cites with approbation the word *democentric* to describe what he wants, graduate education which is "centered in people" rather than in research.

The criticism of too much attention to research and too little to training teachers is almost as old as graduate education in this country. It is one of the persistent questions. Its age indicates that it is by no means a simple question involving a simple answer. Since McGrath advanced a thesis, he could not unfold contrary ramifications. But there are many.

This is an age of growth of knowledge, in the estimation of some, doubled every twenty years or so. Can we have such growth of knowledge without having specialization and fragmentation? Can liberal arts colleges expect to remain untouched? What is the purpose of the Ph.D. degree? Can it ever be anything but a research degree? Can we create two kinds of degrees without making one a secondary degree? And, if one is secondary, it is easy to see which one it will be.

Can teaching and research ever be separated? Should they be? Should we create a system in which teachers cannot communicate properly with researchers? Should we separate even more those who do from those who teach? Should we make it harder than ever for a person to cross over from one field to the other, or to do both teaching and research? Should we restrict the opportunities now opening to teachers to influence directly affairs of government and industry?

McGrath has posed a problem which deserves most serious consideration. How can we create more and better college teachers? His volume would have had more impact, however, if he had not made the graduate school the scapegoat for all the ills of liberal education.

My own view is that if proper breadth of training is given in the undergraduate years,

and it can be done, a foundation of liberal training may be laid which can be built upon throughout the whole lifetime of a teacher. Graduate education then need not be overhauled. With only minor adaptations in the interests of teaching, it can and should remain specialized education.

ELBERT W. HARRINGTON
University of South Dakota

GRADUATE EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES. By Bernard Berelson. The Carnegie Series in American Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960; pp. vi+346. $6.95.

With the support of the Carnegie Corporation, Bernard Berelson has discussed the facts and issues of graduate education with university and college presidents, graduate deans, department chairmen, faculty members, industrial concerns employing professional and technical personnel, and recent recipients of the doctor's degree. He has reviewed the extensive literature of the subject and listed it in his bibliography. He has put in admirably condensed form all the current criticisms of graduate education and has given us in statistical tables the attitudes of deans, faculties, and students toward them. In the two sections devoted to the history and present practices of graduate education, he has remained objective and detached. In the final section of recommendations, he argues cogently for his own conclusions.

In the main, he is a stout defender of our graduate education as it has developed. He believes the graduate school has become the dominant American educational institution, with the prospect of still greater influence. His sixteen recommendations, whether one fully agrees with them or not, seem practicable and possible. He discovers more areas of agreement than a reader of criticisms would suppose, with the division of humanities being most often in a dissenting minority. In general it may be said that he hopes to bring the graduate school up to the level of the professional schools of law and medicine in organization, regularity of procedure, and the general expectation of completing the work for the doctorate in four years' time.

Anyone who has warmed up to Earl McGrath's *The Graduate School and the Decline of Liberal Education* (see review above) will cool off again (or get hotter) after reading Berelson's evidence that the liberal arts college is in a minority group with declining influence. College presidents used to lecture graduate schools on their shortcomings in the training of teachers with some confidence that, as employers of the product, they would be heard with respect; but now the figures make it clear that college teaching is no longer the principal destination of graduate students, and that graduate schools will go their own way in the pursuit of knowledge. The field of speech is a good illustration of how neither an ancient liberal tradition nor a great field of practical usefulness could assure it a place in the educational scheme of things except as it is backed by studies in the graduate school. And in the field of speech we seem to have equal obligations to the university student as a professional, concerned both with intensive specialization and inter-disciplinary programs, and to the college undergraduate as an amateur, to be disciplined toward a broad citizenship and to be instructed in our inherited culture.

EVERETT HUNT
Swarthmore College, Emeritus

AUTOCRACY AND DEMOCRACY: AN EXPERIMENTAL INQUIRY. By Ralph K. White and Ronald Lippitt. New York: Harper, 1960; pp. xii+330. $6.00.

Experimental studies in the behavioral sciences, when they are imaginative, when they deal with vital contemporary problems of human relations, and, above all, when their results dramatically confirm our prejudices, have a way of snowballing in prestige. Thus, in the competition for most referred-to-work of the twentieth century, I suspect that Fromm's *Escape from Freedom* has been run a close second by the Lewin, Lippitt, and White experiments in autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire leadership conducted at the University of Iowa in 1938. But, as the politicians would say, there is apparently still some mileage left in this one. So, twenty-two years and thousands of footnotes later, there appears an entire new book based on the Iowa studies. As justification, the reader is informed that much of the data (e.g., verbatim interaction) has never before been published. Also, say the authors of their earlier reports, "We are a bit ashamed of ourselves for not . . . putting into print some of our speculations about possible relations between our limited inquiry and the broader aspects of life in a democracy."

The resulting volume is a kind of cross between Smith and Lindeman's *The Democratic*

Way of Life and a psychological monograph. A good share of the heretofore unpublished data are, indeed, interesting. The authors' political analyses are in many instances old-hat, but usually well enough written to make worthwhile reading for a college freshman or sophomore. Occasionally new and valuable psychologically-based political insights come through, such as in the discussion of the possibilities of autocracy without frustration, or of the prerequisites for a satisfactory scapegoat.

This reader was rather troubled by the repeated suggestion in the case analyses of "Two Boys Who Made Democracy Easier" and "Two Boys Who Made Democracy Harder" that the ideal citizen is the youth who successfully internalizes adult values. Although a later chapter does point out that full maturity consists of facing and resolving the conflicts between "inner-directed" values derived from one's parents and "other-directed" values coming from one's peer group, I am still not sure (to continue with Riesman's typology) that White and Lippitt see individual "autonomy" as anything more than a compromise between inner- and other-directedness. Although they may be quite right in this, I am not prepared to settle for such a notion until we know more than we do now about the nature and possibilities of creative individuality.

FRANKLYN S. HAIMAN
Northwestern University

STRATEGIC PSYCHOLOGICAL OPERATIONS AND AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY. By Robert T. Holt and Robert W. van de Velde. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960; pp. x+244. $5.00.

This addition to the rapidly expanding bookshelf of volumes on "speech as an instrument of international influence" is aimed to define the purpose and clarify the methods of this agency of modern statecraft. From a background of considerable experience with America's overseas information program, these authors have concluded that the possibilities of what might be accomplished have been vastly under-rated.

They object to the term "psychological warfare," for they believe that the effort to influence the attitudes of foreign populations (and thereby the policies of their governments) ought to be aimed at friendly as well as at hostile nations and that the effort should as often be constructive as destructive. They object to terming these operations "informational," for they think persuasion rather than exposition is their typical purpose.

The book provides a detailed compendium of information of what has been done by the United States since World War II, and as such it is a handy volume of factual reference. However, the chief aim of the authors is not to describe but to exhort.

In their view, the systematic attempt to influence the minds and attitudes of transnational groups ought to be designated as *Strategic Psychological Operations*. They believe this task is of such importance that its director should have a rank co-equal with that of cabinet members—and that he should have direct responsibility for helping to formulate (as well as to reflect) our national policies. In order to effectuate this responsibility, the director should have a staff that gathers information and interprets it, as well as disseminating messages. A primary objective should be to determine what audiences abroad are *susceptible* to American appeals and what ones are *crucial* in affecting the policies of their own governments. This combination of susceptibility and cruciality defines the target audience to which our propaganda should be directed.

Further, our government should realize it is fully as important to try to influence the policies of neutral and friendly powers as it is to combat the policies of unfriendly nations. This understanding would vastly expand the amount of propaganda directed abroad.

Still further, it must be understood that "propaganda" consists of deeds even more than it does of words. Hence, what our government and people do is a major factor in influencing what attitudes toward us are generated abroad. Hence, the Office of Strategic Psychological Operations must be concerned with popular behavior on such questions as racial integration, and with governmental programs for dealing with agricultural surpluses and the rising cost of living.

With such an inclusive point of view, it follows inevitably that the Director of Psychological Operations ought to have an influence within our own government equal to that of the Secretary of Defense, Treasury, or Labor. The book, then, is a bold appeal for recognition of the fact that mass communication and the essential inter-relatedness of nations and peoples in our time require a fundamental reassessment of what is meant by propaganda and of the importance attached to it.

The style of the book is stodgy and its impact is diffused and weakened by what seems excessive attention to bureaucracy. The authors have tried to present both advocacy for a new approach and a blueprint for putting it into effect. Their attempt deserves more serious attention than it is likely to receive. This reader, for one, believes their conclusions are correct and the need for their program is urgent. But the book is scarcely of a type to arouse the breadth and depth of public reaction that will be required to win sufficient support to accomplish the revolution for which they call.

ROBERT T. OLIVER
The Pennsylvania State University

LANGUAGE AND LIFE IN THE U.S.A.: AMERICAN ENGLISH FOR FOREIGN STUDENTS. By Gladys G. Doty and Janet Ross. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson, 1960; pp. xii+621. $6.20.

Ten or twelve years ago a speech text for foreign students was likely to be an assembly of word lists and strings of disconnected sentences, all skillfully loaded with speech sounds but not loaded, unfortunately, with anything else—particularly not with interest, vitality, or usefulness. The teacher had to search out suitable reading material to supplement such a text. This quest was discouraging because readings for adults that are both simple in language structure and engaging to the intellect are hard to find. The text under consideration is ample evidence of the development that has taken place in the intervening years.

The most striking difference from the early texts is in organization and content. This book follows carefully the approved new linguistic methods. Part I is devoted to listening for comprehension and to repetition of sentence patterns. The teacher acts as informant, reading a selection to the students, from which point the students go on to use the patterns presented. Part II contains one of the most significant contributions of the book, a list of prose pieces about America designed to improve reading skill and at the same time to answer typical questions about the United States. A sampling of the topics is: "Musical America," "Religion in America," "American Sports," "The Role of Women in American Life," and "Covered Wagon Days." Vocabulary is controlled during the first readings; assistance is given with new words as it is needed. Meaning is demonstrated by context as far as possible, relieving the student of much of the old bugbear of dictionary-digging—a process that used to slow up language learning painfully.

Part III is an analysis of the structural patterns of present-day American English with emphasis on basic, usable constructions. Many structural linguists will disagree with the analysis of patterns here used. Descriptive linguists and speech people are only beginning the process of getting together. Hopefully, for the sake of the thousands to be taught, they will not abandon the effort to work out their differences. (During 1957-58, 43,391 students and scholars from 145 countries attended colleges and universities in the United States.) Part IV of *Language and Life* is concerned with American English pronunciation, including stress and intonation. A simplified version of the International Phonetic Alphabet is used and patterns of English orthography are also studied. This is perhaps the least up-to-date section of the text. Possibly more should be said about phonemic contrasts and less about "confusions" and "substitutions."

The size and compass of this book is surprising. Material is arranged for a two-semester course, meeting daily. Examples of the many extra sub-sections included are: (1) the section on how to make a speech, planned to fit the needs of the foreign student who finds himself beset with invitations to appear before clubs to tell about his native country; and (2) the section on how to write an acceptance to an invitation and how to write a thank-you note after the party is over. One cannot put the book down without noticing the excellent typography and the complete manner in which the material is indexed. Every available square inch of the paper-backed volume is utilized (even the inside covers), if not for an additional "quick index" then for a chart, a table, or a summary. In brief, if I were a foreign student I should walk briskly to the nearest bookstore and buy this volume and consider that I had purchased two or three volumes in one.

ELIZABETH CARR
University of Hawaii

ORIGINS: A SHORT ETYMOLOGICAL DICTIONARY OF MODERN ENGLISH. By Eric Partridge. New York: Macmillan, 1958; pp. xx+970. $16.00.

The publication of a word-book of this sort should be its own justification, but the com-

piler of this one apparently felt otherwise. The justification may have helped achieve book-club recognition with resultant mass distribution; and so will have more than helped pay the piper. A Foreword opening with the statement that Skeat's similar works were last revised almost half a century ago, and that Weekley's and Holthausen's "treat words so briefly and ignore ramifications so wholeheartedly," would lead one to presume that the present publication was intended to supplant the advancing obsolescence of the former and to correct the shortcomings of the latter; yet neither can honestly be said to be the case. The dust-jacket promulgates this as "an etymological dictionary of the 12,000 commonest words in Modern English" (with sub-entries actually about 20,000), but nowhere is there indicated why these particular "common" words were chosen, other than that "non-specialist" words "falling within the 10,000-or-so used by every intelligent person [may] have been inadvertently omitted." Though "designed for the use of the general intelligent public as well as for that of the erudite," Mr. Partridge claims also to have addressed his latest enfilade on the mother tongue to "those to whom etymology is perhaps rather less familiar than newspapers and football-pool coupons." Daily readers of stock market quotations and race track results need to learn an abecedarian argot of appropriate abbreviations, and so might appreciate their necessity in etymological lexicography. Partridge's cypher, however, may be a bit more of a hindrance than a hint for them. The observation that "a work is not necessarily the more scholarly for being written in philological shorthand" could have been a self-administered nostrum. The cabalic code required for even a short etymological dictionary cannot serve even the logophilous among the canaille, if such there be.

This work sets a new fashion in the presentation of an old science in two regards: with lists of prefixes, suffixes, and "learned compound-forming elements"—"lists that are themselves etymological"; and by grouping all related words or forms together. The latter can be revealing in itself, e.g., "student, studio, studious, study; 'stooge,'" but can also be frustrating, though amusing, e.g., "Coccyx. See Cuckoo." Do so, and find no such reference!

"An etymological dictionary supplies neither pronunciations nor definitions," but definitions are supplied "where, in little-known words, they are necessary to an understanding of the problem." Yet the shift of meaning from "to make a thread or line into" (cf. *filament*) over "to rake with shot," in the case of *enfilade*, for instance, is not explained.

Though Partridge's peartly compact lexicon is informative and readable, it should not have been made out to be all things to all men.

JOHN B. NEWMAN
Queens College

SPEECH SCIENCE: ACOUSTICS IN SPEECH. By Richard A. Hoops. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C Thomas, 1960; pp. xii+137. $4.75.

A student of speech science needs to have many strings to his bow. He needs to know a good deal of anatomy for an understanding of the positions and movements of the organs during speech production. He should have a keen ear to help him discriminate among the sounds which are produced, and he must be somewhat of an acoustician to interpret their physical dimensions in an objective way. He has to have a good idea of the psychology of hearing since, after all, it is the speech that gets heard that counts. Furthermore, he must appreciate several fundamental concepts of linguistics so that he will be able to separate those attributes which are intrinsic to the speech mechanism in general from those which are characteristic of a language, a dialect, or a particular individual.

In order to reach any interesting results in a subject as complicated as the science of speech, it is clear that an interdisciplinary approach is needed. Any elementary text devoted to the exposition of one of the areas mentioned above obviously can be of great value to the student. In the book under review, Mr. Hoops has attempted to provide an exposition of acoustic phonetics from the integrated viewpoint of speech science. Regrettably, the result falls all too short of expectations. The book does not cover many important topics which are central to acoustic phonetics as it has been developed in the past several decades. The material which the author has covered has been done in an extremely irresponsible way, so that any effect the book might have on the student could only be negative.

The field of acoustic phonetics has made great strides in recent years primarily because of the availability of instrumentation for examining speech waves in their frequency domain. Using various Fourier techniques, the

spectrographic representation of phonetic entities has brought insights about speech which could not be had from studying only the gross features of pitch, duration, and pressure fluctuations. This strategy of research is represented in a conspicuously inadequate fashion. This inadequacy is reflected both in the scanty (and often erroneous) explanations that one finds for basic concepts such as "spectrum," and in the narrow scope of the fairly out-dated bibliography. Of the fifty references, only eight are dated after 1950, and the majority of the remaining ones are dated before 1940.

There are too many mistakes to be enumerated here but some of them border on absurdity. Here is a sample: "The non-phonemic regions bear little relationship to the actual sound produced in speech, except that the nasal cavity is often considered phonemic rather than non-phonemic" (p. 113). Even for rather standard notions such as "diphthong," the book falls wide of the mark. There is a figure which shows the "relative sound pressure" dropping to zero right in the middle of a diphthong! Such inaccuracies may be amusing to a phonetician but they constitute a serious disservice to the unsuspecting student.

Clearly, there is a need for books on acoustic phonetics for the student who does not have the technical background to delve directly into discussions on acoustics. It is equally clear that the book under review does not meet this need.

WILLIAM S-Y WANG
University of Michigan

PSYCHOLOGICAL AND PSYCHIATRIC ASPECTS OF SPEECH AND HEARING. Edited by Dominick A. Barbara. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C Thomas, 1960; pp. xii+756. $19.50.

Dr. Barbara, practicing psychoanalyst and head of the speech department of New York's Karen Horney Clinic, has attempted to pool the writings of twenty-five "well-known specialists" to produce a 756-page volume on the psychological processes involved in the origin, comprehension, and treatment of speech, hearing, and communication disorders. The package contains thirty chapters. Eight chapters are concerned with psychological and psychiatric aspects of normal speech and hearing; fourteen with psychopathology of speech and hearing disorders; and eight with psychotherapy of speech and hearing disorders.

Who are the contributors to this volume dealing with psychological and psychiatric aspects of speech and hearing? Eleven hold the M.D. degree. Nine are members of the American Psychiatric Association. Eight belong to the American Psychological Association. Six hold membership in the Speech Association of America. Only five of the twenty-five authors of this volume concerned with speech and hearing disorders hold Advanced Certification in the American Speech and Hearing Association, the professional association of workers in the field of speech pathology and audiology.

For a volume which purports to be the "first and only comprehensive book" dealing with speech and hearing it is difficult to understand the many gaps in coverage. The term psychoacoustics does not appear in the Index. A name as important as Korzybski cannot be found. The contribution of Knower is recognized by including a brief reference to one of his many studies. One small footnote refers to John Carroll. These examples are cited to indicate that this volume has overlooked many topics and scholars which this reviewer believes should be included in a treatise on the psychological aspects of speech and hearing.

Not only are there many gaps in the coverage, but there is little evidence of editorial efforts to synthesize the work of the twenty-five contributors. There is not even uniformity on such a simple matter as treatment of footnotes. In some chapters there is a central bibliography at the conclusion of a chapter. In other chapters all references are cited in footnotes at the bottom of the page. Some chapters develop a carefully reasoned rationale for suggested procedures. Some chapters are rich in citations of evidence. Unfortunately, many of the contributors make no distinction between fact and opinion, and some seem to be avoiding the use of statements of fact if at all possible. One chapter appears to be an abstract of a dissertation. Several chapters seem to be sales talks for psychoanalytic theory. The overall effect is not that of a unified book, but rather that of a series of essays which hang together largely because they share the same binding.

The failure to distinguish beween fact and opinion can be seen in part in some of the following quotations. (1) We learn, for example, that the ear "may be an obvious substitute for the vagina, either in fact or fantasy." (2) "The ear, which in childhood listened to anal sounds, may stand for that area in adult language." (3) "Handwriting analysis, a most sensitive instrument, can give easy access to a wealth of information which routine psy-

chologic tests and ordinary neurological examinations cannot divulge." As hypotheses all the above statements are interesting. Unfortunately, these and hundreds of others are presented so as to lead the reader to conclude that a series of facts has been presented.

Although much of the book struck this reviewer as poorly written psychoanalytic jargon, there were several refreshingly different chapters. Backus provides one of the most lucid rationales she has ever written for her type of relationship therapy. The reader may disagree with the Backus therapy, but its rationale is clearly and convincingly stated. Irwin's discussion of the distinction between learning-centered and psyche-centered therapy deserves wider readership than this volume is likely to provide. Space does not permit the citing of several other chapters which were both well written and well worth reading. In general, however, this reviewer believes that *Psychological and Psychiatric Aspects of Speech and Hearing* contributes little to psychology, psychiatry, speech, or hearing.

JACK MATTHEWS
University of Pittsburgh

CEREBRAL PALSY AND RELATED DISORDERS: A DEVELOPMENTAL APPROACH TO DYSFUNCTION. By Eric Denhoff, M.D., and Isabel Robinault, Ph.D. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960; pp. x+421. $12.00.

The authors of this challenging book are not content merely to ground cerebral classifications and therapy procedures in traditional moorings but build support for an operational philosophy on which to expand thresholds for the search of the functional capacity of the handicapped child. This philosophy for the development of latent abilities is based on the premise that syndromes are not fixed but ever-changing; and that, although the neuro-muscular disturbance may appear to be the most important component to overcome, in reality the associated visual, hearing, speech, perceptual behavior, and emotional handicaps can affect development more than does the motor status.

The framework of the book then leads the reader into capsule-form clinical descriptions of neurological disorders: cerebral palsy, mental retardation, epilepsy, hyper-kinetic behavior, childhood schizophrenia. There are built-in reinforcements from Gesell, Phelps, Perlstein, Fay, Crothers, and other experts. The authors strengthen their structure, however, by housing all facilities on the ground floor: facilities which incorporate understanding of associative sensory and perceptual dysfunctions; approaches to diagnosis, treatment, prognosis; developmental and neurological education; and changing aspects of psychological evaluations. Direct entrance to this core-operation is gained by means of team-ramps, supported by diagnostic and rehabilitative charts and timetables which have been arranged for a practical sequence of events.

There are no closed doors in this arrangement except to those who should "listen more and advise less"; to those who are geared only to mastery of the subject and knowledge of all answers; to those who are "slaves to rules compounded rather than using them as springboards to pertinent action." Certainly entrance is available to all who understand the particular emphasis in the blueprint of developmental activities converging towards useful living for the child as "one handicapped only in so far as his goals outstrip his capacities." Enthusiasm is held in abeyance; eager persons are not encouraged to rush in to overcome all difficulties in a new structure; but there is the intent that the job must be done now for today's children—the job of making firm the connecting links of emotional, sensory, perceptual, and social factors.

For members of the speech profession, the strength of the book lies not in the speech content, but in the integration of speech in the dynamics of the philosophical approach; in the evaluation of studies and discussions on cerebral disorders with associated sensory and perceptual-motor dysfunctions; and in the time-schedules of development, diagnosis, and therapy.

SEVERINA E. NELSON
University of Illinois

BRIEFLY NOTED

RADIO STATION MANAGEMENT. By J. Leonard Reinsch and Elmo Israel Ellis. (Second revised edition.) New York: Harper, 1960; pp. xiv+337. $6.50.

This new and expanded edition of a standard text reflects the tremendous change in radio broadcasting that has taken place since *Radio Station Management* first appeared twelve years ago. It deals with today's radio, beamed at the bedroom, kitchen, and car.

Like the first edition, the major portion describes in considerable detail the functions

of the various departments of the local radio station—news, music, engineering, sales, traffic —and illustrates with charts, check lists, and sample forms how WSB, Atlanta, carries them out. It briefly takes up broadcast law, standards of good practice, and radio research. Its value is enhanced by an added discussion of the principles of administration and programming.

The authors, both working radiomen, address their reader as one about to start his own commercial station. Their advice is directly helpful to those involved in college carrier-current radio operation. As a text, the book supports a very narrow and detailed course in station management.

JOHN B. HANEY
USAF Academy

THE SECURITY OF THE FREE WORLD. Edited by Julien Engel. The Reference Shelf, XXXII, No. 5. New York: H. W. Wilson, 1960; pp. 211. $2.50.

This is a collection of articles which deals with the 1960-1961 high school debate and discussion theme. Included are such items as Senate committee reports; magazine, newspaper, and newsletter articles; speeches; B.B.C. radio talks; and cuttings from books. These are arranged in six sections treating the East-West struggle, the United Nations, NATO, World Law and World Government, the Arms Race, and Underdeveloped Nations, with the editor's comments opening each section. Space limitations required deliberate exclusion of U.S. military policy as a topic, and the editor recommends specific readings to supplement the little said here about world government. In addition, the twelve-page Bibliography presents many useful complementary sources.

The book is by no means a thorough coverage of any aspect of free world security, nor could any work be in this time of fast-moving revolutions, new-born nations, and cold war maneuvering. It is, however, an important collection of information and opinions regarding the debate and discussion topics. Recognizing that most of the readings are editorial rather than strictly informative, the student will find that this interpretative quality enhances rather than diminishes the book's usefulness.

E. SAMUEL DUDLEY
University of Alabama

GUIDE TO GOOD SPEECH. By James H. McBurney and Ernest J. Wrage. (Second edition.) Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1960; pp. x+342. $4.95.

A text designed to stress clarity, usefulness, and economy, the second edition of *Guide to Good Speech* succeeds in its intent by and large. Theory and illustration are well-balanced and coordinated. The style is readable and free of academic jargon. Project instructions are succinct and the projects themselves sound. The inclusion of subdivisions in the Table of Contents is a pleasant innovation. No new chapters are added in this edition though much of the earlier material has undergone sensible revision and improvement.

Three of the four sample speeches included at the end of the text are non-student speeches by recognized men of stature. This section might be more appealing to the reader if the authors had used student examples here as they did elsewhere in the text.

In the matter of usefulness, there is no clear treatment of forms of *emphasis*—a need not commonly met in basic texts yet significant nevertheless. But perhaps it is too much to expect that all of one's favorite themes appear.

In summary, this text is a solid job of making speech palatable to the undergraduate *without* the sacrifice of high standards.

GOODWIN F. BERQUIST
University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee

A HANDBOOK FOR THE AMATEUR THEATRE. By Peter Cotes. New York: Philosophical Library, 1957; pp. xxiv+424. $12.50.

Peter Cotes is a well-known director in the English professional and amateur theatre. In this comprehensive and detailed handbook, he not only offers assistance to those in all departments of production from choice of play to performance, but he also ranges widely over areas usually neglected in an introductory text. These include the formation of amateur organizations, the direction of a first production, the needs of musical and children's theatre productions, the occasional demands for dancing in a play, a list of organizations of aid to amateurs, and a lengthy compilation of amateur organizations both in England and the countries of the Commonwealth. With the refreshing point of view of a stimulating teacher, he addresses himself to the beginner as well as the more experienced amateur.

The fact that this volume was originally designed for English readers accounts for numerous inconsistencies which the publishers no doubt recognized when they decided to issue an American edition. The discussion of play selection, direction, acting, and the manifold

technical activities, however, is limited only to the extent that some stage equipment and practices of the English theatre are a bit different or outmoded as compared to ours. Although this volume fills a gap in our knowledge of English and Commonwealth theatre organizations, unfortunately it includes no comparable compilation of amateur groups in the United States. While the illustrations are too few, a well selected Bibliography leads the reader to other sources which can fill this gap. Aside from these limitations, this handbook is to be recommended to amateurs for an introduction to all areas of the theatre.

GARY GAISER
Indiana University

RHETORIC AND AMERICAN POETRY OF THE EARLY NATIONAL PERIOD. By Gordon E. Bigelow. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1960; pp. iv+77. Paper $2.00.

"Whatever it is in Byron's poetry that is 'wrong'," wrote T. S. Eliot, "we should be mistaken in calling it rhetoric. Too many things have been collected under that name. . . ." The *omnium gatherum* approach to analyzing rhetorical power in poetry is one common mistake which Bigelow's study avoids. Another is limiting rhetoric to *elocutio* or "stylistics"—often with stultifying results. To do justice both to rhetoric as rhetoric and to the poetry as poetry, Bigelow adopts the classical conception of "rhetoric as oratory, the art of persuasion" and applies it to seven American poets of the period 1775-1815. He argues that while "no single distinction provides a net fine enough to sift out all of rhetoric from all of poetic," essentially rhetorical elements do characterize much of the poetry. They predominate, for example, in the Connecticut Wits' mock-epics and Freneau's patriotic odes.

Three of Bigelow's findings hold special interest for students of American public address: (1) The early national period was one of "feeble poetry and lusty rhetoric." (2) Its most representative poetry was "rhetorical" in both a bad and a good sense. (3) Widespread training in elocution encouraged bombast and stylistic extravagance in the poetry.

If further research supports these contentions, they may bring about important revaluations.

RALPH S. POMEROY
University of California at Davis

THE MODERN EDUCATIONAL TREATMENT OF DEAFNESS. Edited by Sir Alexander Ewing. Washington, D. C.: Volta Bureau, 1960; pp. xvi+separately paged articles. $6.70.

In this book Sir Alexander Ewing has edited 72 papers that were read at the International Congress on the Modern Educational Treatment of Deafness which met at the University of Manchester in 1958.

Leaders in several fields relating to the education of the deaf, including audiology, psychology, and medicine, participated in this international conference. Topics under discussion included recent developments in the detection and differential diagnosis of hearing losses in childhood; acoustics; hearing aid design, performance, and use; and the medical and surgical aspects of hearing loss. Papers were also presented concerning the integration of deaf children into a hearing society, clinics for deaf children, linguistic developments, the teaching of speech and language, deaf children with concomitant handicaps, and mental health problems of the aurally handicapped. In addition, commentaries on demonstrations, which were presented over closed-circuit television, are included.

It is the hope of Sir Alexander Ewing that ". . . this book will facilitate free discussion of contemporary problems in the education of the deaf. . . ." For those interested in this area, this book is highly recommended. It provides an excellent opportunity to integrate current thinking and research not only from many countries but also from the numerous fields that contribute to the management of the total problem of the educational treatment of the deaf.

WILLIAM F. PRATHER
University of Iowa

SPEECH THERAPY IN CEREBRAL PALSY. By Merlin J. Mecham, Martin J. Berko, and Francis Giden Berko. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C Thomas, 1960; pp. xii+307. $10.00.

If a book can be measured by how successfully the authors achieve their purposes, *Speech Therapy in Cerebral Palsy* will become a standard in speech and hearing literature. The authors have provided an orientation for all those who work with cerebral palsied individuals, especially children, and have brought together from the literature, their research and observations, a meaningful approach to therapy and education.

The authors hold that even though there is no clearly defined cerebral palsied speech, 70% or more of cerebral palsied individuals have speech and/or hearing problems. Athetoids present a greater variety and incidence of speech disorders. Due in part to a lack of sufficient background experiences, the cerebral palsied child is two to four years below normal in speech and language development. The authors contend that the I.Q.'s of cerebral palsied individuals who showed a wide scatter on initial psychological testing rise significantly during the process of therapy.

The team approach to diagnosis and treatment is considered essential by the authors. Group therapy should form the core of the speech program. The system of therapy as presented by Westlake—psychological training, physiological training, and direct speech and hearing training—is supported and the implications for speech of the contributions of the Bobaths is given consideration.

An outstanding statement of problems and some approaches which have proved successful are presented in the chapter "Communicative Disorders in Academic Learning. . . ."

The speech therapist, psychologist, and special education teacher will find this book an asset in his daily work. Perhaps students preparing to work with cerebral palsied children in any of these areas will derive the greatest benefits from the book. It is not a "how to" book but it is extremely practical. The excellent Bibliographies contribute further to the usefulness of the volume.

Speech Therapy in Cerebral Palsy is a monograph in the Bannerstone Division of American Lectures in Speech and Hearing edited by Robert West.

C. Mitchell Carnell, Jr.
Cerebral Palsy Center of Greater Baton Rouge

BOOKS RECEIVED

THE THEATRE: THREE THOUSAND YEARS OF DRAMA, ACTING AND STAGECRAFT. By Sheldon Cheney. (Revised and enlarged edition.) New York: Longmans, Green, 1958; pp. xvi+592. $8.50.

THE NEW SPEAKER'S TREASURY OF WIT AND WISDOM. By Herbert V. Prochnow. New York: Harper, 1958; pp. xii+473. $4.95.

LINCOLN'S EDUCATION AND OTHER ESSAYS. By M. L. Houser. New York: Bookman Associates, 1957; pp. 356. $4.00.

BEYOND THE CRESTING SURF. By Alan Lindsey McLeod. Pittsburgh, Pa.: Boxwood Press, 1959; pp. x+28. $1.50.

THE PENGUIN DICTIONARY OF QUOTATIONS. By J. M. and M. J. Cohen. Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books, 1960; pp. vi+664. Paper $2.95.

SCENES AND MACHINES ON THE ENGLISH STAGE DURING THE RENAISSANCE, A CLASSICAL REVIVAL. By Lily B. Campbell. (First published in 1923.) New York: Barnes and Noble, 1960; pp. xii+302. $7.50.

THE HISTORY OF REYNARD THE FOX TRANSLATED AND PRINTED BY WILLIAM CAXTON IN 1481. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by Donald B. Sands. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960; pp. x+224. $5.75.

AN INTRODUCTION TO MODERN LOGIC: AN ELEMENTARY TEXTBOOK OF SYMBOLIC LOGIC. By William H. Halberstadt. New York: Harper, 1960; pp. xiv+221. $5.00.

A CONTEMPORARY READER: ESSAYS FOR TODAY AND TOMORROW. Edited by Harry W. Rudman and Irving Rosenthal. New York: Ronald, 1961; pp. viii+441. $3.40.

INTERACTION: TELEVISION PUBLIC AFFAIRS PROGRAMMING . . . AT THE COMMUNITY LEVEL. Edited with an Introduction by Robert Lewis Shayon. New York: Television Information Office, 1960; pp. xii+287. $3.00.

SEVEN ONE-ACT PLAYS BY BERNARD SHAW. Edited with a Foreward by R. Martin Browne. Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books, 1958; pp. x+246. Paper $0.65.

POINTERS ON PRODUCING THE SCHOOL PLAY. By Helen Louise Miller. Boston: Plays, Inc., 1960; pp. xii+112. $2.95.

DISCOURSE OF REASON: A BRIEF HANDBOOK OF SEMANTICS AND LOGIC. By John C. Sherwood. New York: Harper, 1960; pp. xii+112. Paper $1.25.

GUIDE TO SUCCESSFUL SPEAKING. By Harold P. Zelko. Philadelphia: County Agent & Vo-Ag Teacher, 1959; pp. 44. Paper $0.50.

LANGUAGE AND PSYCHOLOGY. By Samuel Reiss. New York: Philosophical Library, 1959; pp. 299. $3.75.

SHOP TALK

ROBERT L. SCOTT, *Editor*

ON THE BENEFITS OF EXTRACURRICULAR EMPLOYMENT

In December, ST reported the result of a questionnaire circulated among speech department chairmen. The responses indicate that there is some bustling activity among our members in rendering professional services as lecturers, teachers, consultants, and researchers for groups outside our academic walls. Our chairmen almost universally judge such activities to be greatly beneficial to the development of stronger teaching in the college classroom (see XLVI, 449-50). In December, ST promised to cite the general trend of comments to supplement the gross totaling of responses.

In general the respondents indicated that those in their departments who render "outside" professional services increase in wisdom, stature, and wealth. Those benefited, in turn benefit their colleges and students. Although only one indicated that he received "substantial" pay for his activities, there was the constant implication that the stature and wisdom that might be gained "outside" probably are not sought for their own sake. The fees are "not unwelcome" as one put it. They may in fact determine what is done and what is left undone. ST knows one speech man who chose what on other criteria might have been the less desirable of two positions offered him because it promised to allow him to do considerable "extra" work for business and industry.

In this day, the better paid one is, the more prestige he is apt to have—both because money buys status symbols and is a symbol of status. At any rate our chairmen judge that working outside the academic confines confers prestige on the professor and on the department with which he associates himself. This prestige, apparently, flows in a number of directions. Supposedly the student knows, perhaps from what his professor says in class or perhaps from the fact that a substitute appears explaining that the regular instructor is abroad being consulted, that a man is in wide demand. The implication is that the student will be motivated to attend more seriously to the demands his professor makes of him. Perhaps even more important, judging from comments received, is the observation that the administrative hierarchy is apt to look with favor upon departments containing men sought by groups hither and yon. ST detects a strong suggestion that the administration, sensitive to public relations, may encourage faculty extracurricular activities in some schools, although many responses indicate that the faculty needs little such encouragement. One note of caution appeared however: "Some . . . enhance their reputations; some do not."

But the benefit most emphasized by our respondents is the apparent positive contribution of "contact" (to use a favorite word), which the world beyond makes to teaching. There are two recurrent themes perhaps worth noting. First, the academic person who ventures abroad rubs shoulders with speech as it exists in the practical world of com-

mercial affairs. Thus he is kept in touch with "reality." His courses apparently profit in that he brings to them material and direction which are more consistent with the demands made on speakers outside the ordinary classroom environment. Second, teaching is apt to improve because the man involved will be stimulated to shake off the slack habits of years of addressing ordinary classes when he is called to teach beyond the friendly walls. As one informant writes, "One must thoroughly prepare to talk to one's peers." The impulse to do his best when hiring out will likely cause one to reform his slothful ways in his everyday teaching, ST assumes from comments received.

Several writers stated specifically that the typical outside assignment might have directly beneficial applications to teaching courses in business and professional speaking but probably would have little positive effect in other courses.

One of the more precise comments was from an assertive fellow who signed his name in spite of the fact that the questionnaire did not seek to elicit an identification. He was out of the mode also in that he does not consider just any outside work to bestow blessings on teaching. "Research work is by all odds the most valuable," he writes. "Most consulting is of little value; most lecturing is of little value; most [outside] teaching is of so little value that it is sometimes a positive disadvantage." This man sees a practical value in being hired for research in that the researcher may be able to "make a contribution" and at least he may gain equipment and insight which will enable him to do constructive work at some later time. Furthermore, this sort of activity is most likely to trickle down to the lower echelons in providing employment for graduate students. On the other hand, "other forms of working for business are but a drain on energy."

Most of those who thought negatively of becoming involved with outside work stressed the possible demerit of dissipating the faculty man's energy. If he has a normal academic load and a sensible commitment to his profession, as one man put it, "he will have more than enough to keep him busy."

ST must confess that reflection on the responses, and especially on the positive responses, has given him some misgivings. Should we not be concerned with "keeping in touch with reality" whether or not we are employed to do certain jobs for various enterprises? Will we not be in a better position to profit from "contacts" in terms of learning and teaching if we are not committed to serving the ends of various interests as employees? Perhaps, finally, we shall be better able to keep our "outside" activities within reasonable limits, to keep these activities from interfering with our primary commitments to our students and our colleges (as almost all respondents indicated that we should) if we operate primarily as observers and critics not as employees?

NEW ENGLAND SPEECH ASSOCIATION CONVENTION. The 1960 New England Speech Association Convention was held at the Eastern Slope Inn, North Conway, New Hampshire, November 25 and 26. The New Englanders tried a new format for their convention. Abandoning section meetings, they held "Cracker Barrel Meetings" in eight areas: forensics, speech and hearing therapy, business and professional speech, general speech, broadcasting, oral interpretation, public speaking, and theatre. There were a moderator and several "resource people" for each meeting to stimulate discussion, but all attending participated actively from the beginning, sharing problems and suggesting solutions. Information reaching ST from several sources indicates that the approximately one hundred members in attendance

were quite pleased with the trial and the N.E.S.A. intends to use the format again in 1961.

The informal atmosphere of the resort hotel added to the success of the convention. ST would guess that the moderate prices of a package deal on room and board aided somewhat also. At any rate, the New Englanders will hold their 1961 convention at the Eastern Slope Inn on November 24 and 25.

Officers of the N.E.S.A. are Edward D. Shanken, University of New Hampshire, president; Inez E. Hagarty, University of Massachusetts, vice president; William L. Whiting, University of Maine at Portland, second vice president; Vera Price, Public Schools, Everett, Massachusetts, secretary; and John Price, University of Rhode Island, treasurer. Margaret McElroy, Public Schools, Higgham, Massachusetts, retiring president, presided over the 1960 convention.

SHOP TALK SPEECH CONVENTION CALENDAR

National

Speech Association of America: Statler Hilton, New York, December 27-30; (1962, Cleveland; 1963 [August], Denver; 1964, Chicago).

American Educational Theatre Association: Waldorf-Astoria, New York, August 28-30; (1962, University of Minnesota, August 24-26; 1963, University of Oregon, August 26-28; 1964, University of Pittsburgh, August 27-29).

American Speech and Hearing Association: Sherman, Chicago, November 5-8.

National Society for the Study of Communication: with SAA in New York.

NUEA Committee on Discussion and Debate Materials: with SAA in New York.

Regional

Southern States: Hotel Everglades, Miami, April 6-7 (High School and College Forensic Meet and Student Congress, April 3-7).

Eastern States: Henry Hudson Hotel, New York, April 13-15.

Central States: LaSalle Hotel, Chicago, April 14-15.

Western States: Fresno State College, November 23-25.

New England States: Eastern Slope Inn, North Conway, New Hampshire, November 24-25.

Summer Institutes and Workshops

A Children's Theatre Workshop will be offered at Colorado State University. Students enrolled for courses in producing and directing children's theatre will have an opportunity to work with children who will be enrolled in another workshop program.

Alan Stambusky and Eric Bickley will conduct an eight-week summer workshop at Illinois State Normal University for high school teachers with limited experience in producing and directing plays.

Los Angeles State College is again offering its Institute for American Studies. The theme of the institute around which the special offerings will revolve is "America in the Modern World." "Drama Since World War I: American and European" is one of the special courses.

A series of short workshops will be offered at Marquette University: a one-week workshop in parliamentary procedure will be conducted by Hugo Hellman; a two-week workshop in coaching debate will be directed by Joseph Laine; Leo Jones will offer a two-week workshop in technical theatre; a two-week workshop in speech correction will be offered classroom teachers by Alfred J. Sokolnicki; and a one-week workshop in special techniques for adapting materials in the teacher's own field for use on television will be conducted by Raymond T. Bedwell.

Northwestern University will present a special symposium to acquaint present and future broadcasters with the issues facing industry and the public today. The symposium will feature persons in broadcasting and related fields as informal guest lecturers. Special attention will be given to the legal problems of broadcasting. Some of the lecturers will be: Lawrence Christopher, Editor, *Broadcasting Magazine;* Franklin Dunham, Chief of Radio and Television, U. S. Office of Education; Frederick W. Ford, FCC; Elmer Gertz, Chicago attorney; Albert Kegan, School of Law, Northwestern; and James A. Stabile, vice president, NBC. Martin Maloney will coordinate the symposium, which will offer both graduate and undergraduate credit.

The Second Annual Seminar in General Semantics will be held this summer at the Castelwood Country Club, Pleasanton, California. Featured speakers will include S. I. Hayakawa, Gregory Bateson, and Dean C. Barnlund. The seminar is being sponsored by San Francisco State College with the coopera-

tion of the San Francisco and Los Angeles chapters of the International Society for the Study of General Semantics. Eugene Rebstock, San Francisco State College, is the coordinator of the seminar.

The State University of New York College of Education, Geneseo, will offer special workshops in theatre for high school students and teachers this summer.

Syracuse University will sponsor its Sixteenth Annual Conference on Problems of Exceptional Children. Special lecturers will include John V. Irwin, University of Wisconsin, "Organic Voice Disturbances," and Robert L. Milisen, Indiana University, "Articulation Testing, Diagnosis and Therapy."

Texas Technological College will sponsor another European Theatre Tour this summer. Students will attend plays in England, Scotland, and many continental European cities. Credit courses may be taken in connection with the tour.

Under the direction of Gene England, the University of Arizona is offering a three-week workshop for classroom teachers in the management of speech and hearing problems. Jack Howe will supervise a five-week clinic for high school debaters.

The University of Iowa will offer a pair of workshops—one for high school students of dramatics and forensics and the other for high school teachers of speech activities. Hugh F. Seabury is in charge of both workshops.

The University of Southern California will hold a six-week symposium in oral interpretation. The symposium, which will focus on postwar literature, will present lectures supplemented by demonstration reading hours, readers theatre, and chamber theatre. Lecturers will be Marie Hochmuth Nichols, University of Illinois, analysis and criticism; Frank Baxter, University of Southern California, contemporary poetry; Frederick Schroyer, University of Southern California, contemporary fiction; Robert Corrigan, Tulane University, contemporary drama; and Zelda Wolpe, psychoanalyst, metaphorical use of language.

The University of Wisconsin will offer its annual Special Program in Community Theatre. In addition to Wisconsin staff members, the program will include special lecturers: Richard Hoover, Pittsburgh Playhouse; John Wray Young and Margaret Mary Young, Shreveport Little Theatre; Eric Salmon, British producer-director; and Jules Irving, San Francisco State College. Wisconsin will also offer a three-week summer institute for high school students in either forensics or dramatics. Thomas J. Murray is director of the institute.

Sundry Conferences and Meetings

In December, Hardin-Simmons University sponsored a two-day workshop for speech teachers, both present and prospective. The guest lecturer was Karl Robinson, Northwestern University, who spoke on "Speech in our Present World" and "The Basic Speech Course." Emogene Emery was in charge of the workshop.

The annual Oregon High School Drama Conference sponsored by the state Thespian society met on the University of Oregon campus February 3 and 4. More than 400 teachers and students attended. Mrs. Melba Sparks of Portland was general chairman; Horace W. Robinson handled local arrangements. William R. McGraw, University of Oregon, was the banquet speaker.

Mrs. Phyllis D. Williamson, University of New Hampshire, conducted a three-day course in discussion for county agents. Sessions were held concentrating on discussion forms ranging from formal panels to role playing.

The department at the University of Wisconsin will sponsor a one day Speech Conference, in collaboration with the department of education, in June. The Conference is designed to enable the experienced high school teacher, the prospective speech teacher, and the college teacher of speech to consider together various ways in which speech instruction can be made more effective in today's schools.

Theatre Schedules

Clarion State College, Pennsylvania: *Macbeth* and *Teahouse of the August Moon.*

Hamilton College: *The Charlatans, Waiting for Godot,* and *The Mouse Trap.*

Hardin-Simmons University: *The Christmas Carol, Agamemnon,* and *Charley's Aunt.*

Marshall College: *Dear Delinquent, The Matchmaker,* and *Annie Get Your Gun.*

Pacific Lutheran University: *Romanoff and Juliet, The Little Foxes, The Christmas Carol,* and two children's plays, *Lincoln's Secret General* and *Rumpelstiltskin.*

Pennsylvania State University: *Three Sisters* and *Paint Your Wagon.*

Queens College: *Tiger at the Gates, Death*

of a Salesman, Taming of the Shrew, and *Winterset.*

Southwest Missouri State College: *Antigone, The Lady's Not for Burning,* and a series of one-acts.

State University of New York College of Education, Geneseo: *Abe Lincoln in Illinois.*

Stephen F. Austin State College: *The Gazebo, The Lady's Not for Burning, J.B.,* and *Once Upon a Mattress.*

Susquehanna University: *Othello.*

Texas College of Arts and Industries: *Morning's at Seven* and a children's play, *The Clown Who Ran Away.*

University of Detroit: *Touch of the Poet, Measure for Measure, Man and Superman,* and *Faust* (Part I), produced in repertory.

University of Florida: *Look Homeward, Angel* and *The Glass Menagerie.*

University of Illinois: *The Servant of Two Masters, The Visit, Twelfth Night, Sons of Man, The Cherry Orchard,* and *The Teahouse of the August Moon.*

University of Missouri: *Dark of the Moon* and an opera, *The Bridge,* in cooperation with the Department of Music.

University of New Hampshire: *The Crucible, The Teahouse of the August Moon, The Trojan Women,* and *Carousel.*

University of Nevada: *Ah, Wilderness!; The Rivalry*; and a children's play, *Huckleberry Finn.*

University of Oregon: *The Enchanted* and *Hamlet.*

University of Virginia: *Look Homeward, Angel*; *The Matchmaker*; *The School for Scandal*; and *A View from the Bridge.*

University of Wisconsin: *A View from the Bridge, Romanoff and Juliet, Summer and Smoke,* and *Charley's Aunt.*

Theatre Notes

The students of Idaho State College endorsed and underwrote the cost of a Fine Arts Week in March. The activities included a production of *Oedipus Rex,* experimental theatre presentations, art exhibits, music and dance recitals, and lectures. Faculty coordinator of the week was Allen Blomquist of the speech-drama department.

Fredrica Shattuck, founder of the Iowa State University Players in 1914, was honored on January 13 at the opening performance of *Mistress of the Inn.* A bronze plaque, engraved with her name, was installed in the lobby of the Theatre Workshop, which will from now on be known as Shattuck Theatre. The Plaque was purchased by Players Alumni to honor Miss Shattuck, formerly head of the Department of English and Speech, who laid the foundation for the theatre program at Iowa State.

A Summer Theatre will be established at Marshall College under the direction of Eugene Hoak. This summer *The Doctor in Spite of Himself* will be produced arena-style with a seating arrangement "cabaret-style" with refreshments served in the manner of a French court with rococo trimmings. An extensive refurbishing of the scene shops, make-up rooms, and lighting laboratory is now being completed.

A three week festival program in March opened the recently completed San Fernando Valley State College Speech Drama Building. The festival featured a production of *Othello.* On March 11 and 12, the college was host for the Southern California Region of the American Educational Theatre Association convention.

The department of speech and drama of Stanford University and the Palo Alto Community Theatre were hosts for the Northwest Drama Conference held on the Stanford campus in February. Four productions were presented during the conference: *Waltz of the Toreadors,* Stanford Players; *The Disenchanted,* Palo Alto Community Theatre; *The Mistress of the Inn,* San Jose State College; and *Beauty and the Beast,* Palo Alto Children's Theatre. In addition to representatives of university, college, high school, and community theatre, the conference was attended by members of professional theatre. Norman Philbrick, Stanford, was chairman of the conference.

The University of Arkansas National Collegiate Players has announced a playwriting contest. The deadline for submitting plays which have not been professionally produced is February 1, 1962. For information concerning the contest write to the Department of Speech, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Arkansas.

The University of Detroit has reorganized its theatre to produce plays in repertory. A magazine, *Repertory Review,* is now being published by the theatre for distribution to its audience.

Sons of Man by T. C. Upham, winner of the Sixth New Play Competition sponsored by the University Theatre in association with the 1961 Festival of Contemporary Arts, was pro-

duced this spring at the University of Illinois. The 1957 Festival award winner, *Tiger Rag* by Seyril Schochen, with music by Kenneth Gaburo of the University of Illinois Music School, had its New York premiere at the Cherry Lane Theatre (off-Broadway) on February 16.

On May 12 and 13 the five best original one-act plays submitted in the playwriting contest sponsored by the department at the University of Missouri will be produced for final judgment and awarding of prizes.

At the University of Nevada, Robert S. Griffin, chairman of the department of speech and drama, lectured on the Lincoln-Douglas debates before the January production of *The Rivalry*.

The Rosamond Gilder Awards for 1961, by the Maine Masque Theatre of the University of Maine, are to be made for the two best English translations of native African plays, and for the best play originally written in English by a native African. The awards are made in the interest of the International Theatre Celebration, which is sponsored by the United States National Commission for UNESCO, and AETA. Scripts submitted for the awards of $500, $300, and $200 must be in by January 1, 1962. For details write to:

Herschel L. Bricker
Chairman ITC
The Rosamond Gilder Awards
Maine Masque Theatre
University of Maine
Orono, Maine.

Appointments

Clarion State College, Pennsylvania: Glenn B. Phipps, assistant professor and director of debate.

Hamilton College: Warren E. Wright, assistant professor, and James R. McClintock, instructor.

Lafayette College: Minott L. Coombs, associate professor and director of theatre.

Marshall College: Eugene Q. Hoak, professor and chairman of the department.

San Francisco State College: Russel Windes, Jr., associate professor, and Lloyd Crisp, instructor.

Stanford University: Richard F. Dixon and J. Douglas Noll, division of speech pathology and audiology, School of Medicine.

State University of New York College of Education, Geneseo: Lois Lavery, instructor.

University of Cincinnati: Henry J. Jisha, lecturer.

University of Florida: R. R. Leutenegger and A. W. Staub, assistant professors; R. G. Jerit, instructor; and Jane S. Letchworth, interim instructor.

Promotions

Hamilton College: Charles L. Todd, Upson Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory.

Los Angeles State College: Louise Binder Scott, associate professor.

Pacific Lutheran University: Vernon A. Utzinger, Dean of the School of Fine and Applied Arts.

Queens College: Robert J. Dierlam and John B. Newman, associate professors.

State University of New York College of Education, Geneseo: Harold B. Starbuck, professor.

University of North Carolina: Lucia Morgan, associate professor.

Leaves

King W. Broadrick is on sabbatical leave from the University of Illinois this semester. He will work in New York and Washington, D. C., gathering materials for a study of the history of legal rhetoric. Charles H. Shattuck, University of Illinois, is taking a census of Shakespeare prompt-books (pre-1920) in order to compile a descriptive catalog. He will spend the summer at The Folger Shakespeare Library, and during his sabbatical leave next year, will visit other collections here and abroad. He would be most grateful to receive news about old prompt-books in private hands.

Margaret S. Hall, University of Iowa, has exchanged positions with Iris Brooke, University of Bristol (England), this semester. Miss Hall will design costumes for the University of Bristol's production of *Murder in the Cathedral* and will accompany the Bristol theatre group when it presents a production in Italy. As a visiting lecturer at Iowa, Miss Brooke will supervise costuming for all theatre productions and will teach classes in costuming.

Foster Fitz-Simons will be on a Kenan leave from the University of North Carolina this spring to do research in New York City on choreography for the theatre.

Kenneth Harwood, chairman of the telecommunications division of the University of Southern California, is on sabbatical leave this semester.

Frederick W. Haberman, University of Wisconsin, will take a summer research leave. Ordean G. Ness will serve as chairman in his absence.

A VOLUME OF STUDIES in honor of Albert Craig Baird, *American Public Address,* is announced for publication this spring by the University of Missouri Press. It will contain fifteen studies of American speakers, including, among others, Clarence Darrow, Robert M. La Follette, Theodore Roosevelt, William Jennings Bryan, William E. Borah, Eugene V. Debs, Ralph Bunche, and Edward R. Murrow. The volume will also contain an introductory essay on Mr. Baird's career. Contributors are his former students at the University of Iowa.

NEW JOURNAL. The first copy of *The West Virginia Speech Journal* was mailed to members of the West Virginia Speech Association in January. There will be four numbers of the journal yearly, according to Stephen Buell, Marshall College, president of the association. Agnes Porter, Marshall College, is editor.

SPECIAL ISSUE. The Spring, 1961, issue of *Western Speech,* a special issue devoted to "The History of Academic Speech Education in the West," will include sketches of seventeen departments and of seventeen pioneer educators. Copies may be ordered at $1.25 from Earl Cain, Speech Department, Long Beach State College, Long Beach, California.

SAA ANNUAL DIRECTORY. *1961 Directory of the Speech Association of America* was published in February. It runs to 585 pages, 31 more than the 1960 directory. Copies may be ordered from Robert C. Jeffrey, Executive Secretary, Indiana University, at $3.00 postpaid. The executive secretary is also the editor.

NEW DEPARTMENT. The Board of Trustees at the University of New Hampshire established a new Department of Speech and Drama as of July 30, 1960. Before this time work in speech and drama had been offered in the English Department. The new department has been responsible for a number of special programs in communities near Durham. Students of discussion and debate under Mrs. Phyllis D. Williamson have been speaking before various civic clubs on current topics. Students from the speech clinic have appeared to inform leading citizens of the problems of speech rehabilitation. Joseph D. Batcheller is chairman of the new department.

NEW BUILDINGS

In February a new theatre was dedicated in the Golden Center at Queens College. The five-hundred seat, air conditioned theatre is equipped with an Izenour Electrical Board which will allow fully automatic operation. "The stage is larger than those in over ninety percent of the Broadway houses. It is large enough so that four sets can be stored off stage while a fifth is being 'played'," our informant writes. The dedicatory play was *Tiger at the Gates,* directed by Robert J. Dierlam.

A new Fine Arts Bulding was opened at Stephen F. Austin State College last spring. The building has two auditoriums fully equipped for theatre productions. One auditorium seats 1,953 and the other 214; both share a common stage. The building also includes a scene shop, costume room, two studios for radio classes, a speech clinic, classrooms, and offices.

In October the University of New Hampshire dedicated the Paul Creative Art Center, which contains a theatre seating 735. The building also contains a 125-seat experimental theatre which can be used either arena or semi-arena style, a scene shop, costume room, storage, classrooms, and offices.

AUTHOR! AUTHOR! Shop Talk has asked the editor to append a note about President Kennedy's inaugural speech as covered in Notes and Comments, *The New Yorker,* February 4, 1961. In case anyone missed the article it should be recalled that Aristotle and Cicero were brought to bear on the speech with a prediction that rhetoric may now become a less "dispensable member of the liberal arts." The author concluded with a salute to rhetoric on the new frontier:

> And so we leave the speech to the students of rhetoric, having invoked for Mr. Kennedy the blessings of Aristotle and Cicero, and for ourself the hope that he has reëstablished the tradition of political eloquence.

One expects almost anything from *The New Yorker,* but finding they have a classical rhetorical scholar on the staff was a bit surprising. The Fourth *QJS* Editor (1927-1929), Everett Hunt, wrote: ". . . best classical criticism of a classic I have seen in a long time. Must have been done by a Cornellian. Will try to find out." About a week later he wrote:

The comment on Kennedy as an orator in the classical sense was written by a 1960 graduate of Swarthmore, Susan Lardner. She studied classics with Helen North, a *QJS* contributor (remember her "Rhetoric and Historiography," XLII, 234-242). This is one of the first things Susan has had published.

What to do with this valuable bit of classified information? We wrote to Miss Lardner asking her permission to reveal identity, and saying as an award we would send her a copy of the forthcoming April *QJS* with an article on all inaugurals since Washington's. She replied she would turn over the letter to the editors for an opinion, and that she "would love to have a copy of your April issue."

The next day came a letter from *The New Yorker* saying Miss Lardner was indeed the author, and "neither the editors nor the author have any objection to your mentioning this fact. We're glad you liked the piece." It was signed FK. FK, eh? Wonder who that could be. Maybe the Fourth Editor knows.

R.M.

HIGH SCHOOL QUESTIONS. The Committee on Discussion and Debate Materials of the National University Extension Association announces that the problem for high school discussion and debate for 1961-62 has now been chosen. From the general problem three discussion questions and three debate propositions have been phrased.

Problem Area: What should be the role of the federal government in education?

Discussion Questions:

1. Should the federal government provide the states with aid for education?
2. Should federal aid be provided for teachers' salaries?
3. Should federal aid be provided for qualified students?

Debate Propositions:

1. Resolved: That the federal government should provide additional aid for public school facilities.
2. Resolved: That the federal government should guarantee an opportunity for higher education to qualified high school graduates.
3. Resolved: That the federal government should equalize educational opportunity by means of grants to the states for public elementary and secondary education.

Each state league is free to chose from these questions and propositions or to phrase its own. Each year, however, the majority of high schools use the suggestions of the NUEA Committee.

The Committee publishes *The Discussion and Debate Manual* and sponsors a free materials program each year. Any questions about materials or the general function of the NUEA Committee should be directed to Bower Aly, Executive Secretary, Committee on Discussion and Debate Materials, Box 5302, University Station, Eugene, Oregon.

CURRICULUM

Los Angeles State College is now offering an M.A. in speech and hearing therapy.

The speech program at Southwest Missouri State College has been increased by nine new courses: two are in interpretation, two in theatre, and five in public address and discussion.

With New York State Education Department approval of certification in speech correction, the Speech Department of the State University of New York College of Education, Geneseo, is now offering programs leading to certification in speech and hearing correction and in speech education.

Syracuse University school of speech is now offering a new course, language and meaning, conducted by J. Edward McEvoy. Mr. McEvoy developed the course after attending the 1960 Conference on General Semantics held at the University of Hawaii last summer.

Tufts University will inaugurate a new program in Humanistic Studies in September, 1961. The program, sponsored by the Fund for the Advancement of Education, emphasizes coordinated undergraduate—graduate years of study and inter-disciplinary work. Seven departments—classics, drama, English, French, German, history, and philosophy—are combining their efforts to offer future college teachers a wide and deep preparation in one major area and two related areas.

RADIO, TELEVISION, FILM

The Marshall College radio station has applied for an "on-the-air" status to the FCC to permit FM broadcasts. The station, WMCH, has been operating a campus-wired service. The West Virginia school, which has a radio and television major, uses television facilities at three Huntington and Charleston commercial stations.

Station WNUR, Northwestern University, was granted permission in December by the FCC to increase its power from ten to 1000 watts. This spring at Northwestern, Gilbert Altschul of Gilbert Altschul Productions, Chicago, is instructing the advanced film production class. In recent years he has produced and directed award-winning films for such organizations as Armour Research Foundation, the Pure Oil Company, and the National Edutional TV and Radio Center. The Chicago Chapter of the Association of Women in Radio-Television is cooperating for the third year in presenting a non-credit course for senior women at Northwestern. An outstanding student will be selected to be a guest of honor at the AWRT national convention in Washington this spring.

On November 13, a group of Ohio professors met in Dayton to present a televised discussion over WLW-D on the 1960 presidential campaign. The discussion was moderated by George Biersack, University of Dayton, and by Austin Freeley, John Carroll University. Participants and their topics were: Harold F. Harding, Ohio State University, "The Campaign Speaking of John F. Kennedy"; Paul H. Boase, Oberlin College, "The Campaign Speaking of Lyndon B. Johnson"; Raymond Yeager, Bowling Green State University, "The Campaign Speaking of Richard M. Nixon"; Bernard F. Phelps, Miami University, "The Campaign Speaking of Henry Cabot Lodge"; and Paul D. Brandes, Ohio University, "The Use of Emotional Appeals."

At Ohio University kinescopes of brief (thirteen minutes, thirty seconds) discussions are being used to stimulate discussion in small sections of a basic required course, Introduction to the Fine Arts. The films are seen in small classrooms in sections conducted by graduate students. Those in charge of the course feel that considerable instructional time is saved and yet the stimulation of immediate response to material in small groups is maintained. There is no thought of re-using the material without revision from year to year. Executive producer for the series is F. Craig Johnson. Script supervisor is Anthony Trisolini, and Producer-Director is F. Brooks Sanders.

On December 19, the Children's Theatre Players of the State University of New York College of Education, Geneseo, presented *Aladdin and the Magic Lamp* in a special television production over WROC-TV, Rochester. The production was seen by 16,000 in-school viewers, in addition to the regular viewers of WROC-TV's eleven county coverage area. The "Aladdin" story was adapted for television, produced and directed by Alice S. Austin and John A. Davis. Mr. Davis will produce a special educational program, "The Story of the Book," for the college's Library Education Division and WROC-TV for National Library Week in April.

On December 13 Texas Christian University's speech department presented "The Gift of Christmas" on Fort Worth's KTVT. This live TV program featured high school and elementary schools of the city and TCU's departments of speech, ballet, and music.

Reading Hours

At Southwest Missouri State College, Delores Gideon, an Alpha Psi Omega member, directed a readers theatre version of Peter Marshall's sermon on Christmas for the annual Christmas midnight vesper service.

The University Theatre of the University of Oregon sponsored "The Interpreters," a group of readings, as part of the annual Festival of Arts held on the campus during February. The Portland group, under the direction of Arthur Coe Gray, presented Ibsen's *Ghosts*.

Personals

While serving as visiting professor at the University of Illinois during the first semester, A. Craig Baird appeared on a program called "The Master Teacher and His Students." Mr. Baird, professor emeritus, University of Iowa, was interrogated by six former students. The students, all now teaching at Illinois, were Kenneth Burns, Otto A. Dieter, Halbert E. Gulley, Richard Murphy, Elaine Pagel Paden, and Karl R. Wallace.

Paul R. Beall has been elected conference chairman for the Fifteenth National Conference on the Administration of Research to be held at the University of Puerto Rico in October.

Paul D. Brandes, Ohio University, has been named executive secretary-treasurer of Tau Kappa Alpha, national forensic honorary society.

On November 30, friends and members of the speech department staff of the University of Florida honored H. P. Constans at a banquet held at the Hotel Thomas in Gainesville. The occasion was the retirement of Mr. Con-